

[27th November 1923]

III**PANEL OF CHAIRMEN.**

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I hereby appoint the following four gentlemen to be a panel of chairmen for the session 1923-24:—

The Raja of Ramnad,
Professor M. Ratnaswami,
Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar, and
Mr. K. V. Ramachari."

IV**QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.**

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the Government have issued any whip to the nominated or official members of the Legislative Council to vote against the Resolution to be moved by Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi on the 27th November 1923?"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The hon. Member has addressed the question to me as Home Member. I beg to inform him that I am the Finance Member. I am very glad to dispense with notice and give him the information which he desires. The answer to his question is in the negative."

**MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MINISTRY.**

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Sir, there is an impression among the hon. Members of this House that this motion is a vote of censure on His Excellency the Governor. I want to know whether it will be a vote of censure on His Excellency, and, if it will be one, I rise to a point of order."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. President, I rise to a point of order. This question is out of order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I understand the hon. Member, Mr. Rama Rao, to ask me, first of all, if this resolution is a vote of censure on His Excellency the Governor, and, if so, he raises a point of order as to whether it is allowable. My reply is: he must make up his mind by looking at the paper whether it is a vote of censure or not. If, after he has made up his mind, he rises up and tells me that it is a vote of censure, and that therefore he objects to it, then it will be for me to say whether it is a vote of censure or not." (Laughter.)

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Mr. President, I rise to move:

'That a humble and dutiful address be presented to His Excellency the Governor submitting that the Ministry, as now constituted by him, is against the weight of the verdict given by the country in the general election and does not possess the confidence of this House.'

In a way, Sir, my path has been eased by the point of order raised, since you gave the clue that if any hon. Member felt that this address, either in its wording or its intent, conveyed a censure on His Excellency, he might address you to that effect and request you to disallow it on that ground. No hon. Member has dared to rise, put that construction on it and appeal to you to throw it out on that point of order.

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

"I feel that in many respects this motion is unique in the annals of the Legislative Councils of India. Sir, knowing the tone and temper of this House on a discussion of this kind, I shall conform to the warning you gave me in private, that I should try my best to keep the level . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. It is not usual for hon. Members to refer to any warning that I might have given to them in private." (Laughter.)

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, at any rate I did not quote it. It is incumbent on all of us on this occasion to try to keep the level of the debate in as high a state as possible and not allow the temper to rise to fever heat. Needless to add that, so far as I and the anti-Ministerialists who are with me are concerned, every effort will be made—and I trust with success—to avoid anything savouring of personal attack or even personal courtesy.

"I must say that this mode of allowing the Council to express, by direct method, whether it has confidence in a Ministry constituted or not, is an advance in the direction of constitutionalism and that inference is irresistible from the very principle. In England debates of this kind are raised on the Address. On the Continent it is usual for the Ministry itself to ask for a vote of confidence before entering on its duties. Under the circumstances, here, we thought it best to move this humble and dutiful Address to His Excellency the Governor. I need not say, Sir, that it is absolutely unnecessary for any one associated with me in this matter to say that neither directly nor indirectly do we base this motion on His Excellency's action. His Excellency has every right to empanel the Ministry; and we, on the other hand, Members of the Legislative Council just returned by our electorate have a right also to submit whether such a Ministry commands our confidence or not. This is not in any way a reflection on the entire Government either. There seems to be an idea abroad that the Reserved section of the Government also is, in some way, affected by this motion. That again, I submit, is a fully erroneous construction. On the contrary, I wish to say that we do not intend directly or indirectly to refer to the administration or policy of the Reserved Government or even to the Ministerial connexion with or influence on the Reserved Government whether as members of the Administration or as heads of a party. I do trust that all hon. Members associated with me on this occasion will kindly bear this in mind, viz., that according to the terms of the Address itself we have to confine our attention to the Transferred Departments of the Government and to the action of the Ministers in connexion with the portfolios they hold. Let me make this position as clear as possible so that nobody may be under the impression that we intend, in this indirect manner, to attack the entire range of Government and, in vain as it were, the Reserved half which has been already enough protected by Statute. This question refers only to the Ministry, and the Ministry being responsible to the Legislative Council, hon. Members of the Legislative Council have got every right—and not merely the right but the obvious duty—of knowing definitely what exactly the situation is. We do not propose to go any further than that in this discussion.

"Our task has been rendered easier by the fact that in Madras we have adopted, it may be by convention or by some other means, a Chief Minister.

11-15 a.m. Therefore, if we could show that the hon. the Chief Minister does not possess our confidence, that is justification enough for

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [27th November 1923]

the collective term of Ministry that I have employed. I shall confine myself to the position of the hon. the Chief Minister. If I may convey to this House that the hon. the Chief Minister has not the confidence of the country and of this Council, that is quite enough for me. I raise the contention contained in my Address on two grounds: the first is the result of the elections and the second is the record of the hon. the Chief Minister. I want to say a word or two, under the second item, on the manner in which the Ministry was reconstructed after the elections. If I have time I shall certainly refer to it and if I have no time, other hon. Members will see their way to deal with that aspect of the problem also.

“Sir, first let me say that the appointment of Ministers is usually determined, in most countries, by the elections themselves. If the elections go against the Ministry, even if the record of the Ministry is good, there is still ground why the people should disapprove of it. If the people have returned at the general elections sufficient members who are not supporters of the Ministry, there are grounds for voting ‘no-confidence.’ For, ‘no-confidence,’ strictly speaking, is no censure. If the country has made up its mind to try either a new set of principles or a new policy or even to negative the continuance of the existing policy, that is quite enough for passing a vote of ‘no-confidence.’ The wish of the country has revealed itself in the general elections. As I shall show presently, an analysis of the general elections is very interesting and it throws light on the manner in which the old Ministry, so powerful, has become weakened so far as the confidence of the people is concerned.

“If we analyse the elections from Ganjam downwards, we shall find that staunch Ministerialists have gone to the wall and members of the Swarajya Party, Moderates, Liberals of the old Congress camp, Independents and those who do not belong to the Ministerialists’ Party have been returned. Staunch adherents of the Ministry have either suffered defeat or come back with reduced majorities. Ganjam is a Ministerialistic district. The hon. the Education Minister is only one, out of the three returned, who, I believe, would be called a staunch Justice-party man in the old sense of the term. Vizagapatam returned two members, none of whom belong to the Justice Party. Godavari is, I regret to have to say, an ex-Ministerialistic district and the Ceded districts returned one Ministerialist and one anti-Ministerialist. Kistna has returned two anti-Ministerialists and one Ministerialist. Thus, district after district may be analysed, e.g., Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah and Nellore. I do not exclude the computation in Kurnool; its claim will be for independence. I would rather avoid any reference to my own district of Chittoor. It is distressing for me to find my hon. Friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, sitting on the bench opposite. Far more significant in many respects is the election at Coimbatore. It returned three anti-Ministerialists and no Ministerialist.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“Coimbatore has never been with the Ministerialist Party. Mr. Ramalingam Chetti disclaimed that he belonged to the Justice Party.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“On that basis, my hon. Friend Mr. Patro has himself never been a Ministerialist.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“I never disclaimed so publicly that I belonged to any particular party. On the other hand, Mr. Ramalinga Chetti disclaimed publicly.”

27th November 1923]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ Since my name has been dragged in, and since the hon. Mr. Patro disclaims my working with the Justice Party, I wish to say that we were working together.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I accept my hon. Friend, the Education Minister’s explanation. He only says that he never disclaimed his connexion so publicly. (Laughter.)

“ In Tanjore, we have non-Brahman Swarajists and an anti-Ministerialist Brahman returned. Sir, I need not take you through the whole geography of the Madras Presidency in its electoral aspect. But there are a few elections which are very peculiar, and, I would almost say, of the first and foremost importance. It has been one of the charges levelled against the hon. the Chief Minister that in appointing district board presidents and members of several local boards, attempts were made to strengthen those men who would be his staunch adherents. However that may be, I may say that district board presidents have come to grief because of the nominations they have received. That is a thing which tells its own tale. In Kistna, while Mr. Mocherla Ramachandra Rao was away in England on public business connected with the Education Commission, his place was mysteriously declared vacant, and, in spite of the fact that the Kistna District Board passed a resolution that his place should be thrown open to election, it was given as a gift to an ex-Colleague of mine in this Council, Mr. Balaji Rao. Though so many as eleven candidates stood for election in that district this nominated president comes last but one. In Bellary, Mr. GopalaSwami Mudaliyar—I regret to have to refer to him as he is my old teacher—was given every position that he could occupy. He is the Public Prosecutor there ; he is the chairman of the municipality.” (A voice : No ! No !)

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ He was chairman when the election took place.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I am referring only to the time when the election took place and not to the situation as it is at the present moment.

“ He was chairman of the Bellary municipality. Not content with these two duties which would tax the energies of any man, my poor old teacher was made the president of the district board. The result was disastrous. At Coimbatore, it was, that Mr. Rathnasabapathi Mudaliyar who had his chance against the hon. Friend of mine sitting to my right (Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar) was made the president of the district board. I believe in one other district also, in Godavari, a nominated president—and nominated district board presidents can never resist the temptation to occupy seats in the Legislative Council—stood for the Legislative Council and he fell. This is the story of the kind of things that have taken place in the elections.

“ Let us turn to smaller general groups like Indian Christians. Three of my friends are not to be found here to renew my acquaintance. One is an ex-Council Secretary, who has been beaten by a gentleman, who has rarely been on the election field. From the West Coast it has not been possible for the old member to regain his position. That is the case also with the Northern Circars. Three new men out of five have come in. But what is most telling is what took place in the case of the Moslem representatives in this Council. Moslem Members, who claimed to be part and parcel of the old

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [27th November 1923]

Justice Party, have met with a general defeat at this election. My hon. 11-30 a.m. Friend, Dr. Usman—whom I congratulate, though in his absence, on the high position which he now occupies in the civic life of Madras—though he was returned unopposed in the previous election, dared not offer himself for re-election. That is indeed a reflexion on the way in which the old representatives of the electorates discharged their duties in this Council. I regret to have to say that these old representatives felt their position here one in which they could give full play to their individuality free from their representative character, and, in consequence, met with failure at the elections. The new Moslem Members, as the *Madras Mail* put it, are a very different lot; may I, with your permission, Sir, submit that they are a much better lot?

“Sir, if I have proved negatively so far that the Ministerialists have been viewed with general disfavour throughout, this is the positive aspect of the proposition: to be told that certain Ministers, especially one whom I do not wish to particularise, are against a particular candidate was as good as giving him two to three thousand votes for the mere asking. Dr. C. Natesan, Sir, my hon. Friend who is now on the Opposition Bench, in spite of the best services he had rendered to the party in power in the past, was banged and boycotted, and because of that he has topped the poll in this city with an extraordinarily large majority. In a similar way I might refer to other instances.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“Did Dr. Natesa Mudaliyar stand as a non-party candidate or non-Justice candidate in the City of Madras?”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Sir, this is like having the light where there is a big blaze already and there is nothing dark or obscure. Dr. Natesan stood independently of the very leader of the party and if that does not suffice to prove the proposition I have advanced my hon. Friend must consult the elementary text-books of logic. (Laughter.)

“It will be remembered, Mr. President, that in the old Justice Party, as in the old Liberal Party, there were two wings: the conservative section and the more democratic progressive section. Such a party can be helped in its position only by a proper balance between the two sections with respect to its influence, its powers, etc. If you, Sir, analyse the position of this Council at the present time, you will see that it consists of a number of groups amongst which the progressive section of the old Liberal Party ought to be in power. We have got the old Congressmen. I believe they have not changed their name in the way the Liberals have done (hear, hear!). There are Swarajists; there are at present members who are out to serve both the country and the community in a way, which I trust will be far more truthful than that which the Ministers have adopted, and to these have been added the progressive section of the old Justice Party. I have to mention this because in spite of our endeavours to prevent the debate from degenerating into personal level, it may be just possible for one hon. Member or two to question the good faith with which I am standing in my present position to-day. I will only say that on several questions connected with the policies and principles as well as in the methods to be adopted in the deliberations of the party I differed, and differed in a way that was a matter of public knowledge. To mention a few instances, I will first refer to the question connected with the internal management of the party, like the constitution necessary for it, which I was the very

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

first to demand, and which was put off for one reason or another for over two years. My second reference is this: It was through the instrumentality of the City Association, of which I am still the President, that Home Rule, Dominion Home Rule, was put down as one of the objectives of the Justice Party. On the question of Malabar tenancy, again, I took up an attitude which did not find full favour with the official leaders. When that question was mooted before the party, my friends told me that it might be treated as a district subject and that it was not one of provincial importance. On the subject of political prisoners, I tabled more than one question in this House, and the attitude of the official leaders of the party and the Ministry is well known. So also in matters of social service, social organization and in many other things. I hope I have not broken my compact. (A voice : No !). I am glad to hear 'No'. I am only trying to explain my personal position. In the last programme, of my old party, of the 1st July, some items were put down at my special request claiming that our party should co-operate with other parties in the country on matters of national interest like the question of Kenya, the status of Indians abroad and other matters. But the party conference chose to observe the principle of distant pollution as regards the other parties in our own country. I understand that they are still going to observe that distant pollution with regard to the other parties. Though some of the followers of the party may still remain orthodox, it is gratifying to me to find that the leaders at all events have abandoned the principle of distant pollution if not on principle at any rate for the sake of a few votes and to secure their position in their constituencies. Sir, with regard to the other problem, namely, our attitude towards the depressed classes, I expect my hon. Friend Dr. Natesan to speak at length. On all these matters, most of them belonging to principles and policies, and a few which I am precluded from entering into, concerning the internal management of the party, the methods to be employed, etc., we have had differences, and differences which have led us to separation inevitably and naturally. Like the Peelites of old we have come out of the Conservative Party.

"Sir, for the moment I shall not refer to the subject of Ministerial reconstruction because of certain delicate personal considerations which a valued Friend of mine put before me after I came into this House. But I wish to state that it would have been far more graceful on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister if he had confronted this Council with the old Cabinet entire, taken a vote of confidence, which I believe he would not have found any difficulty in getting, and then requested one of his Colleagues to vacate his place in view of the fact that we had all agreed to include a Tamil member. But see how things are passing. It is an ugly aspect that is now presented before us. It looks as though without a reconstruction a vote of confidence from this House would be unpardonable. The hon. the Chief Minister perhaps thought the difficulty would be over by the exclusion of one Member from the Ministry and his replacement by a Tamilian Member of Tinnevelly. Sir, I do not think that this was the best possible mode of dealing with an ex-Colleague who was sharing the burdens and responsibilities for three years. It is a delicate subject, and although I wanted to say something more about it I would rather refrain from further referring to it out of a duty I owe to a former Colleague of mine and out of deference to the best traditions of Parliamentary life which you, Sir, are so very anxious to introduce in

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [27th November 1923]

this Council. I thought my duty required me to refer to this matter. I hope my hon. Friend, Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai, will not misunderstand me when I say that even with reference to his appointment, there is some difference of opinion. Ministerships are after all intended to be held by people of a slightly different type and antecedents."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I rise to a point of order, Sir. The hon. Member is casting a reflection on His Excellency the Governor’s action. The hon. Member is criticizing certain individual appointments apart from questions of policy or programme. I understand that the hon. Member criticizes a particular appointment on the ground that a certain class of people, retired Government servants, ought not to be chosen as Ministers. That I think is trenching on ground reserved for His Excellency the Governor. The hon. Member, I quite well see, may say that a particular gentleman does not enjoy the confidence of the House or that his programme is reactionary. But if the hon. Member says that a particular appointment is not proper, I think it is questioning the propriety of His Excellency’s conduct.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think the hon. Member has committed a breach of the rules. The hon. Member said that a particular appointment made by His Excellency was not a suitable appointment because the individual concerned had been long in Government service.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ My point was this, Mr. President: If I had thought for a moment that the appointment was the individual act of His Excellency, even if I had cause to differ, I would not have ventured.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. At present I am engaged in considering the point of order raised and I allowed the hon. Member, Mr. Reddi, to rise to correct me if I had misunderstood him.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Not at all, Sir. I object to the appointment of Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai—I am sorry I entered on the subject for it brings in delicate considerations—I object to the appointment on his long service, on his age and on account of the fact that he had never been in politics.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member, Mr. Reddi, thinks that His Excellency was wrong in appointing the person concerned. Surely, hon. Members are aware that His Excellency is the head of the Executive Government who sanctions a number of things and would himself be the last man to desire that all his actions should be free from criticism. Neither His Excellency’s *bona fides* nor his motives are being questioned. It is simply said that he made wrong appointments. The whole motion is that.”

11-45 a.m. The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Sir, does my hon. Friend, the Mover of the resolution, admit that it is a reflection upon the exercise of His Excellency’s right to nominate the Ministers ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ So far as I am able to see, he says that His Excellency has made wrong appointments to the Ministry, and that he has appointed three men who do not possess the confidence of this House. If that is to be considered a reflection upon His Excellency and should not therefore be permitted, we need not have assembled here at all to-day.”
(Laughter.)

27th November 1923]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Mr. President, I understood the Mover to say that he was not going to cast any reflection upon the Reserved subjects. But would it not be a reflection if a suggestion is made against the exercise of choice by His Excellency the Governor ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Mover did make a promise not to say anything about the Reserved subjects ; but, of course, he is not bound by his own promise ” (laughter).

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ That settles the question.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Besides, it is open to the hon. the Minister to say afterwards, when his turn comes, that the hon. the Mover made such a promise and that he did not carry it out ” (laughter).

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Mr. President, I may point out in the first place that such an appointment is not a Reserved subject. I am criticizing only what has been done in the Ministerial half ; and let me further explain that my criticism was based on the impression—I may be wrong, but am open to correction—that such appointments to the Cabinet were made on the advice of the Chief Minister. But if the hon. the Raja of Panagal says that he gave no such advice and that the appointment was made by His Excellency alone, I am prepared to withdraw what I said.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Sir, I left the choice to His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Without mentioning names ? ” (laughter).

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. I do not think that at present we can go into a discussion of what the hon. the Chief Minister told His Excellency. The resolution as tabled is to the effect that these three gentlemen, who are now occupying the Ministerial places, and who have been appointed by His Excellency, do not command the confidence of the House. It is a plain resolution which really can be discussed upon its own merits. They have been appointed by His Excellency, and here is Mr. Ramalinga Reddi who says that they do not command the confidence of the House. I dare say the hon. Members on this side (right) are going to say that they do command such confidence. We shall know whether they do or not later on when the poll is taken. But why not allow the discussion to proceed ? (hear, hear !) ”.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I thank you most heartily, Sir, for protecting my freedom of speech on this occasion (laughter). ”

“ I would now refer to the administration of the local boards by the hon. the Chief Minister. I do not know, Sir, whether I shall be in order if on this occasion I refer to the speech delivered at the inauguration of this Council yesterday by His Excellency the Governor. Well, Sir, even if such a thing is not desirable, there is nothing to prevent me from repeating all that His Excellency said without quoting His Excellency’s authority. I do not think anything more damning could have been better said against the administration than this one sentence, i.e., that discipline amongst the officials connected with the local boards has become considerably slackened and that the officials have been attending to other work besides their strict duties. We in this Council can hold the hon. the Chief Minister entirely responsible for

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [27th November 1923]

the administration of local affairs, and he cannot divest himself of that responsibility by saying that the presidents of the different boards are responsible if the administration goes wrong. It is the Minister in charge of it that is held responsible in every country in the world, and if we want to make the principle of responsibility a reality instead of a sham, we ought to hold the hon. the Chief Minister responsible first and His Excellency afterwards. That a paper of the standing of the 'Madras Mail' should have written in its leading columns that yesterday's speech constituted an indictment by His Excellency on the purity of local board administration, is itself a matter for grave consideration by the Members of this Council. In this connexion, though I do not wish to deal with the Transferred subjects in any detailed manner whatsoever, I would like to put two questions to whichever hon. Member is in charge of the Legislative Department, i.e., whether it is a fact that a superintending engineer canvassed during the last elections for one of the ministerial candidates, and whether his attention has been drawn to the allegations in the Press that the officials of the different local boards went about canvassing for presidents, chairmen and other dignitaries who wanted to add to their dignity by getting a position in the Council. These are allegations publicly made. I have been told also that a Government Order was issued informing them that such conduct was illegal and reprehensible. That again, Sir, raises the question whether that order was obeyed.

"I now wish to refer, Sir, to some very peculiar ways which have become current in the administration of local bodies regarding the appointment of district board presidents. I have already mentioned the case of Kistna which asked for an elected president, but Mr. Bala jirao Nayudu was thrust upon it. In Coimbatore, an old party man was displaced by one who, it was thought, would be their party man. My hon. Friend, the Raja of Ramnad, and my hon. Friend, Mr. Vijayaraghavulu Mudaliyar, were re-nominated to their places almost before their terms expired, whereas in some other cases such re-nominations were not forthcoming with such lightning-like rapidity, and the place in Tanjore is being kept vacant, I do not know for how many months. (A voice:—'Five months.') It may be that there is some explanation forthcoming, but an administration which cannot go on without daily explanations and hourly apologies is not the kind of administration we want in this Council. Again, what has happened in Bezwada in connexion with the municipality there? Hon. Members from the Kistna district would be able to tell us clearly how the people there were kept on waiting for months and months for elections. I need not remind the old Members of this Council that I tabled a series of questions on this matter.

"Sir, I rather fear also that in many ways Ministerial prestige and power have suffered, and there is only one explanation for it. Last time it was an open secret that the Ministers were consulted with reference to the nominations made to this Council for the protection of special interests—the depressed and backward classes and others who cannot get representation through election. It is also an open secret that no such consultations have been made this year."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. President, I do not know if the hon. Member is in order in criticizing the nominations of some Members of this Council made by His Excellency the Governor and in referring to the persons he consulted in the matter."

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

first to demand, and which was put off for one reason or another for over two years. My second reference is this: It was through the instrumentality of the City Association, of which I am still the President, that Home Rule, Dominion Home Rule, was put down as one of the objectives of the Justice Party. On the question of Malabar tenancy, again, I took up an attitude which did not find full favour with the official leaders. When that question was mooted before the party, my friends told me that it might be treated as a district subject and that it was not one of provincial importance. On the subject of political prisoners, I tabled more than one question in this House, and the attitude of the official leaders of the party and the Ministry is well known. So also in matters of social service, social organization and in many other things. I hope I have not broken my compact. (A voice : No !). I am glad to hear 'No'. I am only trying to explain my personal position. In the last programme, of my old party, of the 1st July, some items were put down at my special request claiming that our party should co-operate with other parties in the country on matters of national interest like the question of Kenya, the status of Indians abroad and other matters. But the party conference chose to observe the principle of distant pollution as regards the other parties in our own country. I understand that they are still going to observe that distant pollution with regard to the other parties. Though some of the followers of the party may still remain orthodox, it is gratifying to me to find that the leaders at all events have abandoned the principle of distant pollution if not on principle at any rate for the sake of a few votes and to secure their position in their constituencies. Sir, with regard to the other problem, namely, our attitude towards the depressed classes, I expect my hon. Friend Dr. Natesan to speak at length. On all these matters, most of them belonging to principles and policies, and a few which I am precluded from entering into, concerning the internal management of the party, the methods to be employed, etc., we have had differences, and differences which have led us to separation inevitably and naturally. Like the Peelites of old we have come out of the Conservative Party.

"Sir, for the moment I shall not refer to the subject of Ministerial reconstruction because of certain delicate personal considerations which a valued Friend of mine put before me after I came into this House. But I wish to state that it would have been far more graceful on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister if he had confronted this Council with the old Cabinet entire, taken a vote of confidence, which I believe he would not have found any difficulty in getting, and then requested one of his Colleagues to vacate his place in view of the fact that we had all agreed to include a Tamil member. But see how things are passing. It is an ugly aspect that is now presented before us. It looks as though without a reconstruction a vote of confidence from this House would be unpardonable. The hon. the Chief Minister perhaps thought the difficulty would be over by the exclusion of one Member from the Ministry and his replacement by a Tamilian Member of Tinnevelly. Sir, I do not think that this was the best possible mode of dealing with an ex-Colleague who was sharing the burdens and responsibilities for three years. It is a delicate subject, and although I wanted to say something more about it I would rather refrain from further referring to it out of a duty I owe to a former Colleague of mine and out of deference to the best traditions of Parliamentary life which you, Sir, are so very anxious to introduce in

[The President]

[27th November 1923]

time which may well be devoted to the merits or demerits of the Motion, may be spent otherwise. It is entirely for the hon. Member to follow my advice or not."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“Thank you, Sir. That, again, is a matter which I would ask hon. Members to ponder over.

“In conclusion, my contention on this point is that for 12 noon. these various reasons the Legislative Council, in the exercise of its primary duty of seeing that the truly *de facto* responsible Ministry alone is allowed to continue in power, has to vote for this Motion. The elections have gone against the Ministerialists.

“Then, Sir, the record of the hon. the Chief Minister, on which I do not wish to dwell at greater length, is one that can under no circumstances be approved by a legislature which has the interests of the people at heart. What surprises me most is that after all the criticisms that have been directed against the administration for the last two and a half years and against what was heard in the Council itself, the hon. the Chief Minister should still continue to hold that portfolio of the department of Local Self-Government. It has been said that if this Address is carried, the Council will be dissolved. I hope, Sir, I am not transgressing the limits of prudence when I say that no such danger need be apprehended. Once again I reiterate the proposition that voting in favour of this Motion is not in any way, directly or indirectly, voting against His Excellency the Governor, still less, as some people seem to apprehend, against His Majesty King George V. We have a clear duty here, viz., to uphold the rights of the Legislative Council and to honour the wishes of the people who have just returned us to this House. If every Ministry that is formed by His Excellency be accepted as such and given confidence for no other reason except that it somehow got itself appointed, then good-bye to the principle of responsibility.

“Then again I would request my hon. Friends not to be misled by anything that might be said regarding what the hon. the Ministers would do in the future. Responsibility attaches itself only in two ways: that is, if, as a result of the general election, the people have gone against them, they too must go; and, secondly, it attaches only to the past record and not to any progress that they may make in future. On an occasion like this, about the policy of the future every one will be promising everything that is asked and everybody who cares to ask for. Responsibility, as I take it, would attach only to their past record.

“If, Sir, the terms of my address are analysed, it will be found that all that I have stated is that this Ministry is against the weight of the verdict given in the general election. I hold that if the majority of the elected members vote with me, then it means that in substance my motion is carried. If, on the other hand, it is said that it is possible for a popular Ministry not to have an elected majority and yet to possess the confidence of the House, then I leave that diarchical paradox to be solved by the liberal statesman who is at the head of the Government. If this address would secure the support of a majority of elected Members, be it the majority of one, that, so far as I am concerned, will suffice. If, on the other hand, this address is thrown out, what will be the result? The result would be that we would be expressing confidence in the Ministry, that we would be upholding all their policies and all that they have done so far and giving them a power

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

of attorney to do likewise in the future, that we give them power to continue the kind of administration that has been our misfortune to witness in the local bodies and that we wish this administration to be stereotyped, as it were, for the future. If, on the other hand, the Address is carried, it means that the country at least desires to see whether a newer policy could not be attempted and whether other persons might not be entrusted with those duties. In England very often in the general elections the party in power is defeated and another party comes in, because the country is desirous of having as it were a change of climate for its health. In the same way also in the last general election our presidency has declared against the Ministry, and, if this Address is not carried, it means that all things that we have been complaining against are matters which have received the approval of the people's representatives and that we have given them a charter to continue in the same way. I honestly think that it would be in the interest of the country to see if better men and better policies should not be given preference.

"With these few words, Sir, and with your permission, I have the honour to move :

'That a humble and dutiful Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor submitting that the Ministry as now constituted by him is against the weight of the verdict given by the country in the general election and does not possess the confidence of this House.'

Mr. MUHAMMAD MOOSA SAIT :— "Mr. President, Sir, I beg to second the Motion moved by my hon. Friend Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :— "Sir, I am glad that an opportunity has been given, while on this Motion, of explaining the constitutional position and the position of the Ministry during the last two years. If only the hon. the Mover had placed before the House some definite statements, some specific charges, specific charges of omission or commission, then it would have been possible for me to meet all such specific and definite statements and acknowledge or disprove them. The hon. the Mover has, as usual, and as he did in his opening speech at the Dravidian Association, started with general observations, vague statements and insinuations which it would be impossible for any one to answer. If there were only specific and definite statements upon which the hon. Member had based his case, it would have been easier for me and for my hon. Colleagues to reply to them."

"Throughout his speech he has assumed the analogy of the British Cabinet system. He assumes that the whole system of the British Cabinet has been ordered to be incorporated into the Indian system. I do not want to dispute any such convention at present, but I do want to warn the House and the hon. the Mover that he cannot assume such an analogy from the British constitution. We are governed here by a legislative measure. The Government of India Act lays down definitely how the Ministry has to be constituted. We have got provision embodied in section 52 of the Government of India Act to which I would ask your indulgence to refer. The fundamental principle that we should remember in that connexion is that the appointment of each Minister proceeds statutorily from the Governor. In England Ministers are Colleagues chosen by the Premier; the practice has been to leave the formation of the Ministry entirely to the Premier for the time being who is summoned by the Sovereign to form a Ministry."

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

first to demand, and which was put off for one reason or another for over two years. My second reference is this: It was through the instrumentality of the City Association, of which I am still the President, that Home Rule, Dominion Home Rule, was put down as one of the objectives of the Justice Party. On the question of Malabar tenancy, again, I took up an attitude which did not find full favour with the official leaders. When that question was mooted before the party, my friends told me that it might be treated as a district subject and that it was not one of provincial importance. On the subject of political prisoners, I tabled more than one question in this House, and the attitude of the official leaders of the party and the Ministry is well known. So also in matters of social service, social organization and in many other things. I hope I have not broken my compact. (A voice : No !). I am glad to hear 'No'. I am only trying to explain my personal position. In the last programme, of my old party, of the 1st July, some items were put down at my special request claiming that our party should co-operate with other parties in the country on matters of national interest like the question of Kenya, the status of Indians abroad and other matters. But the party conference chose to observe the principle of distant pollution as regards the other parties in our own country. I understand that they are still going to observe that distant pollution with regard to the other parties. Though some of the followers of the party may still remain orthodox, it is gratifying to me to find that the leaders at all events have abandoned the principle of distant pollution if not on principle at any rate for the sake of a few votes and to secure their position in their constituencies. Sir, with regard to the other problem, namely, our attitude towards the depressed classes, I expect my hon. Friend Dr. Natesan to speak at length. On all these matters, most of them belonging to principles and policies, and a few which I am precluded from entering into, concerning the internal management of the party, the methods to be employed, etc., we have had differences, and differences which have led us to separation inevitably and naturally. Like the Peelites of old we have come out of the Conservative Party.

"Sir, for the moment I shall not refer to the subject of Ministerial reconstruction because of certain delicate personal considerations which a valued Friend of mine put before me after I came into this House. But I wish to state that it would have been far more graceful on the part of the hon. the Chief Minister if he had confronted this Council with the old Cabinet entire, taken a vote of confidence, which I believe he would not have found any difficulty in getting, and then requested one of his Colleagues to vacate his place in view of the fact that we had all agreed to include a Tamil member. But see how things are passing. It is an ugly aspect that is now presented before us. It looks as though without a reconstruction a vote of confidence from this House would be unpardonable. The hon. the Chief Minister perhaps thought the difficulty would be over by the exclusion of one Member from the Ministry and his replacement by a Tamilian Member of Tinnevelly. Sir, I do not think that this was the best possible mode of dealing with an ex-Colleague who was sharing the burdens and responsibilities for three years. It is a delicate subject, and although I wanted to say something more about it I would rather refrain from further referring to it out of a duty I owe to a former Colleague of mine and out of deference to the best traditions of Parliamentary life which you, Sir, are so very anxious to introduce in

27th November 1923]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Who are the others ? ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ There are only two parties, one the non-Brahman party and the other the party formed by the rest including the hon. Member, who represents the University (Mr. Satyamurti) ”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ This even is not accurate, for I do not belong to the party of the hon. Member representing the University.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I am very glad to be corrected by my hon. Friend that there is another party also.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Nor is it correct to say that all non-Brahmans form one party.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Well, we have not had that party system obtaining in more advanced countries and my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, has never declared to what party he belonged, whether he belonged to the non-Brahman party which was working with a majority, or whether there was any other party to which he specially belonged.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ That statement, Sir, is not true.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I have yet to know what the correct statement is. He has not made it clear to which party he belongs; we have to ask whether he has no cult or any political faith whatsoever.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ You yourself, Sir, were pleased to say some time ago why I took a position all by myself.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ If he is a political party by himself, well, hon. Members can imagine what his position is.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Anyhow that proves to the hilt that the statement that all non-Brahmans form one party is not correct.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I say there is only one non-Brahman party, and I repeat it because there is no other non-Brahman section which has been formed into a definite party with any programme different from that of our own party.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ The party to which I belong includes many non-Brahmans.”

Mr. ABBAS ALI :—“ Sir, we have also formed ourselves into a party of our own last night.” (Laughter.)

Mr. PEDDI RAJU :—“ We in our district fought as anti-Ministerialists.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ It is very clear that the House is at liberty to form 127 parties within itself. I am the only man who is unable to form a party (laughter). That being so, may we not leave this question alone and proceed further with the Motion before the House ? ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I am also very glad that so many parties have been formed, because each group must work as a party of its own. But I have been referring to a state of things two and a half or three years ago. We have been working in the last Council as the non-Brahman party against all the other parties. It is to that I have been referring and not to what has happened after the elections. When were the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[27th November 1923]

different parties and creeds formed? What we have to take into consideration is this: what is the plank or what is the programme with which we approached the electorate for election? What is it we have stated to them? With what principles and policies have we approached the electorate during the last elections? That is what we have to consider as of fundamental importance and not what you and I did last night. It is therefore most relevant to say that at the time of the elections when we approached the electorate, there were two parties only. Consequently, to say that particular members belonging to the non-Brahman party have now come to declare themselves as a different party or that they adopt a particular card or ticket, is entirely irrelevant to the position taken up in this Resolution."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"We fought the elections as Swarajists; for the last six months, we declared ourselves as Swarajists."

Mr. ABBAS ALI:—"We fought as Muhammadans." (Laughter.)

Mr. M. RATNASWAMI:—"May I ask whether the Muhammadans could have fought the elections as any other than Muhammadans?" (Laughter.)

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"That only emphasizes my position, namely, that when we went to the elections we went merely as Muhammadans, Indian Christians or non-Brahmans."

Mr. PEDDI RAZU:—"It was not exactly so."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I do not know what the hon. Member for Kistna means. But so far as I could see—"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"In Coimbatore, there was no difference between Brahman and non-Brahman. We three went to the electorate as anti-Ministerialists."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—"I went as an anti-Ministerialist, Sir." (Laughter.)

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"As I have already said, each hon. Member is perfectly at liberty to do anything he likes. But the hon. Members should allow the Minister to go on with his speech without interruption and should hear what he has to say. If hon. Members should disagree with him, they will have an opportunity of explaining their views of parties and things of that sort. But we must hear what the hon. Mr. Patro has to say."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, as I said already, at the time of the election, we went to the electorate declaring our party programme. What was the result? On the whole, we have been more successful; our friends who have been working with us, and the non-Brahmans who have been one with us, have been returned on the whole in a majority, and we have not lost any place. If in one district we lost one place, we gained in another district; and if we lost two places in one district, we gained the two places in another district. The net result has been in favour of the party for which we have been working all these years. I would have been glad if the hon. the Mover of the Resolution had shown by any figures that the net result of the election has been that the party which was working for the last three years had dwindled down and had been reduced in numbers. On the other hand, the figures show that the party has really gained more strength and support than in its infancy, and that the party for which we have been working has on the whole gained and not lost, or that at least it maintains

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

the same strength in this Council as before. I beg to ask whether any case has been made out here by the hon. Mover that the result of the elections went against the Ministry at all. No. The hon. the Mover of this Resolution has said that many of the Ministerialist candidates that have been put up have failed. I must say most emphatically that neither the Ministers nor the Ministerialist Party have ever put up any particular candidate. On the other hand, when there has been a contest between two or three non-Brahmans who have been working with us, we did not prefer one against the other, because it was immaterial whether the one candidate or the other succeeded. That was the understanding on which the non-Brahman candidates went to the last elections. Therefore, if one non-Brahman has been defeated, another non-Brahman, equally good, equally able and equally loyal to the party has been returned. So, there has not been any loss whatsoever to the party in the general election. This being the state of matters, it is perfectly clear that no case has been made out at all on the first part of this motion.

“Then, my hon. Friend has made a statement that because certain nominated district board presidents who have stood as district board presidents lost their seats, it is a great reflection upon the party. On this, Sir, I ask the question whether among the nominated district board presidents, the hon. Member, Mr. Narasimha Raju, was not one.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—“I did not belong to the non-Brahman Party.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“The hon. Member is a non-Brahman, and yet he has been successful.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“May I know by whom the hon. Member was first nominated as president, district board? I think the choice was that of the last Government.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“I nominated the hon. Member, Mr. Narasimha Raju.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“Taking the presidents of the Guntūr and Tinnevelly District Boards, they are gentlemen of the non-Brahman Party, and they have been returned. Therefore, I submit that it was not because they were nominated presidents that they succeeded or failed, but because of the circumstances peculiar to the districts concerned. We are all aware how elections are manipulated. The results were due to extraneous causes but not because a particular candidate happened to be a party man or simply because he was a nominated president of the district board. Otherwise, the cases of Tinnevelly and Guntūr are inexplicable.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—“North Arcot also.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“I thank the Raja of Ramnad for reminding me of North Arcot. Therefore, the question of the defeat of the non-Brahman nominated presidents, according to the principle advocated by the hon. the Mover, has nothing to do with the strength or loss of the non-Brahman Party, and such a contention does not at all establish his case.”

“There is another point which was raised in the course of the argument of the hon. the Mover, that certain persons had actually been put up in certain districts and that because they were Ministerialists they have been

[Mr. A. P. Patro] [27th November 1923]

defeated. The Ministerial Party does not hold itself responsible for the success of every candidate. Is it a fact that every candidate put up by the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party in England succeeded in the general election? If it is not the case in a large advanced country where the elections are fought out on definite principles and policies, is it a wonder in this country that a few of the members who have been supported by the party have been defeated? The point you and I have to see is what the total strength of the party is: whether it has been reduced in the general election to such an extent as to make it impossible to carry on the administration of the country and be responsible for the Government, or to such an extent as to have lost the confidence of the House. If you look at facts, I am sure there can be no other answer than to say that the Ministerialists have gained strength and not lost the confidence of the country.

"Then, Sir, the hon. the Mover has referred to another item, and said that there were three Indian Christians who supported the party but lost their seats. I hope, Sir, I am speaking correctly when I say that my hon. Friend, Mr. J. D. Samuel, is as enthusiastic as, or even more enthusiastic a member of the party than, Mr. Palmer. Again, I find that Mr. Cruz Fernandez is even more enthusiastic in the matter of supporting the party than perhaps Mr. Periyannayakam was. Therefore, in the case of the Indian Christians, we have gained more strength in the elections. If one loyal soldier has gone, we have been able to replace him by an equally faithful soldier. Therefore, our ranks have not been thinned or weakened in any way. I welcome the new hon. Muhammadan Colleagues and I hope they will not be led away by any persuasive eloquence of the hon. the Mover of this Resolution. They are independent and able to judge for themselves. (Mr. Abbas Ali: 'Hear, hear'.) But I am sure that my hon. Muhammadan Friends will maintain their independent position and will not fall into any net set up by eloquent speeches (laughter and cheers). I am sure they will judge the facts placed before them in a dispassionate manner and I know that though the creed of some of them will not permit them to support the Government, such of them as are not against the Government will certainly support the Government. Then, Sir

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"On a point of order. There is no question of the Government here."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, the hon. the Mover has said that he has been with the party, that he has been asserting himself in the party, that he has been doing this or that, in order to show that he was a living and not a dead partner but that he had kept up his life and maintained a certain amount of fire in him. But did the fire blaze up suddenly on the 13th of November after the Ministry was announced, while there were no symptoms of life before that? I pause for an answer. I am sure that you will all realize that there was no more enthusiastic supporter of the non-Brahman Party of this Council than my hon. Friend Opposite who has been working with us steadily and steadfastly, and yet—it was rather a

surprise to me—he blazed up suddenly. He avowed that he 12-30 p.m. would yield to none in the opinion that no Ministry that is non-Brahman should be supported. There in that important speech you have his creed and you have his political faith. Therefore, Sir, I may ask, when

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

did he see the light, when did it dawn him that he should stand against it? Is it on the 13th of this month when the new Ministry was constituted that he became a convert and confined his own party to a retrograde measure, to a conservative outlook and a step which is not in the interests of the country? Until then he was a loyal supporter of the party which is now called the most iniquitous, unpractical and reactionary one though his policy and methods are fully embodied in the records of the South Indian Liberal Federation and there you may have his creed and faith. But now the light has dawned upon him and it has revealed to him that he has been in a dim atmosphere from which he should extricate himself."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, I do not wish to interrupt the high flown eloquence of the hon. Mr. Patro. But I do wish to say that there were two parties, the conservatives and the progressives, and I have always belonged to the progressive radicals and I gave an account of the measures in which I differed from them. I note the insinuation underlying his observations but in reply I will only say that it is beneath my contempt to answer. My loyalty has been well recognized by no invitation to me for the meeting at Narayan Bagh."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, truth is a difficult thing to repudiate. I come back to the position I have been talking on. Light having dawned upon him now, he says he has come out of the dim atmosphere and he is now free. I congratulate him if he is really that. But let me also point out that he will be directly against the cult he has so long been advocating."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"Sir, may I explain—"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"If the hon. Member has got a point of order I will certainly hear him at once. But if there is any explanation, it is a matter for consideration whether he may not explain himself later on. Apparently the hon. the Minister is not going to be the only gentleman who is going to attack him. I appeal to the hon. Mr. Reddi to consider if he cannot put off all these explanations for his reply. If he however wants to do it then and there, he is quite at liberty to do so."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I thank you for your advice, Sir, and I shall reserve my explanations to the last."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Then, Sir, reference has been made to certain matters in the Local Self-Government Department. I think he is right in having referred to it. But that is, I am afraid, an indictment not on the Ministry, not on the persons who are responsible for the laying down of the policy: but on those who are responsible for carrying out the policy of the Ministers, on those in whom the Ministers have reposed some confidence; attempt was made to train these gentlemen in the Local Self-Government Department; it is an indictment upon those betters who by election come into the local boards, municipal councils, corporations or district boards—"

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know, Sir, if all the members of the local bodies are elected?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"These local bodies have been under their control and if their finances are in a state of confusion, the fault cannot be on the head of the Ministry. There have been two Acts

[Mr. A. P. Patro] [27th November 1923]

passed during pre-reform days by which the local bodies were given very liberal and large powers so that they may develop their civic responsibility. Subsidies from Government were obtained to strengthen and support the confused state of their finances and if the representatives in the local bodies have not been able to avoid such confusions the Ministry cannot for one moment be held responsible. They are empowered to raise their revenue and in fact full responsible Government and full Swarajya was already in their hands. Therefore Sir, the Ministry cannot be held responsible for any confusion that is now existing. As a matter of fact, when these bodies were in a financial crisis, subsidies were got for them with a view to help them in their difficulties and to restore their normal position. Now I ask, is this an act that you should now condemn the Ministry for? There may be some defects, some irregularities. We have been responsible for the policy and any confusions in the local bodies administering it will be set right in time.

“ There is another point I may mention. While the salaries of all other services were reorganized those of the local bodies have remained. It cannot therefore be said that the policy alone was responsible for these confusions. If you do not give what is their legitimate demand, there can be no contentment or satisfaction. Reforms cannot be worked with a discontented service—local or Government service.

“ I have thus answered two charges on which the Mover has based his case. The last one is with regard to the future. I would not detain the House with reading to you the Administration reports ; but I would only point out that it was the Ministry that was responsible for the progress in Transferred departments.

“ But, Sir, when we worked the first budget we found that the allotment 12-45 p.m. had been inadequate and when we pressed on the attention of our hon. Colleagues and His Excellency the Governor we were given, Sir, an increased allotment over the allotment that had been sanctioned before. Again, Sir, when we found that our expenditure was not enough to meet the demands of our principle and policy, we got more from the Reserved side. Gradually we have been gaining ground and gradually we have been getting concessions from the Reserved side to the Transferred side for the development of the various departments. Then, Sir, you will see that with regard to the provincial allocation of revenues, which is a most important and fundamental issue, we have been able to obtain an increase of two per cent. Now, Sir, I will refer to the expenditure side. Consider the expenditure on mass education or popular education. Look at the expenditure during the pre-reform days on elementary education and the education of the depressed classes and compare it with the expenditure incurred on these things to-day. There is a difference of 18 lakhs. The expenditure now is 18 lakhs more than what it was before the reforms or during the year in which we began the reforms. During the year when the Ministry took charge of these subjects, Ministers had not very much experience as to the allocation of revenues.”

“ Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know whether the increase of 18 lakhs is due to the increase of pay to the staff in the Agency or to the staff connected with education ? ”

27th November 1923]

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I will be able to furnish it to my hon. Friend if he only asks me otherwise. I do not want to waste the time of the Council over this question. There is an increase of 18 lakhs in the course of two years. Is this not a record to the credit of the Ministry ? This sum we have been able to obtain in the midst of the financial stringencies from the Reserved side for the expansion of mass education. I would ask you to bear in mind the circumstances under which the Ministry began its life. You know the condition of the country when the first Ministry was formed. What was the condition of the country ? It was a period of great unrest—a serious unrest. We had a rebellion in the west ; we had non-payment of taxes in the north ; we had a depleted exchequer ; we had retrenchment. Retrenchment was the cry of this House, retrenchment was the cry of the public and the air was filled with the cry. It was a period of financial depression ; it was a period of unrest when we began our work, and it was most unfortunate that we had to cut every thing to the bone. We wanted to retrench as much as possible and we have now created discontent amongst our ranks. It is most unfortunate from the point of view of the proper administration of the country. The report of the Retrenchment Committee will be shortly laid on the table and hon. Members will see the amount of work done by the Ministers in the matter of retrenchment. Well, I have shown you the figures which prove that we have expanded mass education. It is a national service. It is a national service because the expansion of elementary education is a national service. It has got the foremost claim on the exchequer of this province. So in these directions we have been able to advance more than the pre-reform days. Again, Sir, I wish to refer to the reform in the matter of the district educational officers. This is a scheme which has been pending for a very long time with the bureaucratic type of Government. It has not been possible to carry out this scheme which was demanded eight years ago. A resolution was moved in the Provincial Conference on this subject by myself. The scheme has now advanced so far that we now see the district educational officers and the scheme has been put into operation. You will now find that the people are associating themselves in the administration of the country and gradually this has been carried on in a manner which is consistent with the policy and principles of the Ministers and the party. There is one other progress which we have been able to achieve. It has been suggested and suggested repeatedly from platforms and Congress resolutions that it is necessary that we should raise the status of the village and that we should restore the village to its pristine condition, because without raising the condition of the village, without taking the villager into our confidence and without making him more efficient we will not be able to carry on our administration. Even the Montagu-Chelmsford Report lays emphasis on this condition, viz., the improvement of the status of the village. Let me refer to what we have done with regard to the village. There are two or three agencies that are important in order to obtain a well balanced administration, viz., the village officers, the village schoolmasters and the village panchayats. If the village officers are discontented, then there will be no proper administration. If you have a discontented set of schoolmasters they will not be able to assist you in the matter of the village organization or the improvement of the condition of the village. Realizing these two conditions we have increased the salaries of these village officers as well as the schoolmasters.”

[27th November 1923]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ I did not raise in my speech any point about the Reserved departments. My hon. Friend has been referring to the village officers and he has no business to take credit for it. I have already given an undertaking at the beginning that I will not refer to the Reserved subjects.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am by no means certain that the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Reddi did refrain himself from all reference to the Reserved departments. I have got a hazy idea of his references to some elections, which, I believe, are managed by the Reserved half of the Government.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ There are two matters which the hon. Member referred to, viz., the question of nomination and the question of election, and both are part of my portfolio.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, you will kindly permit me to take the second point first. I was dealing with the subject of discipline prevailing in the ranks. I wished to draw the attention of the hon. Member in charge of the portfolio to the complaints which have appeared in the press that a certain superintending engineer directly canvassed for a Minister. Sir, was I not entitled to do that ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member is perfectly entitled to do it. But on a motion of censure on the Ministers the hon. Member has drawn the attention of the Reserved half of Government to certain election irregularities. I only say that the hon. Member has not been abstaining from all reference to the administration of the Reserved half. I am only saying this from memory. Assuming that the hon. Member has refrained from all reference to the Reserved half, there is nothing to prevent the Ministers from so referring. They are not bound to follow the hon. Member’s lead. If the hon. Member makes his attack in one way the Ministers are not bound to defend themselves in that way. They may defend themselves in any way.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ There is one submission I wish to make, Sir. They are going to take credit for the things done in the Reserved departments. That is not quite fair to us. With reference to the objectionable method in the election I intended them and I do intend them as a reflection on the Ministers or district board presidents or whoever the person may be and not on the manner in which the thing was administered by the Reserved half. If you think that it bears the other construction I won’t say a word more about it.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ At present we can deal only with questions of order. The hon. Mr. Patro is in order in referring to certain matters relating to the administration of the Reserved half.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I have referred to the village officer as a strength in the unit of administration. I referred to the school-masters for the same reason. We have formulated a scheme for the expansion of the village panchayats. Under the scheme formulated we had already inaugurated throughout the Presidency a number of village panchayats ; under section 15 of the Village Panchayats Act several powers have been conferred on the village panchayats. From these powers you will see that when they are properly exercised the village panchayats

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

become practically autonomous in certain matters. We have also under consideration the amalgamation of the village munsif's court. When that is done, you will find that all the disputes, all the struggles and all the quarrels in the village can be settled by this panchayat. A scheme has been framed, though it does not relate to me directly as it relates to my hon. Colleague, for the formation of forest panchayats throughout the Presidency. In that scheme of development we have supported the Reserved side and unequivocally supported it in order to see that the villagers may settle various disputes, small quarrels that may arise in the village in regard to the forest administration. Similarly, Sir, in regard to the village school the policy that has been inaugurated forms a training ground for the villagers in matters of administration. The district educational councils have been so framed as to prepare their own courses of study. If any subject is peculiarly fitted to any local area, the district educational council can sanction its own curriculum. Therefore we have made the village more efficient. In another matter you will find that the condition of the village has been improved, viz., co-operative credit. You will find that great expansion has been made in respect of co-operative credit in rural areas. When the system has been begun in rural areas and for groups of villages, the villager can get away from the clutches of the proverbial sowcar. Now the credit society seems to be a reality. These organizations show how far the Ministry has been providing relief to the villagers so that the villages might be autonomous in administrative matters. Instructions have been given to these villagers in order that they might be able to see that they have got proper advice in matters agricultural. I have summarised all these to show that we have taken steps, effective steps, in order to improve the conditions of the villages, in order to raise their status and in order to give opportunities to the villagers to make themselves efficient and capable and to be able to take part in the higher administration of the country. Is this a very reactionary measure? Is this a progress which you do not need?

" In dealing with my own portfolio, I would respectfully submit to hon. Members that we have encouraged elementary education.

1 p.m. We have been able to carry on free and compulsory education in urban areas. We have been urging this policy of free and compulsory education from every platform. Fourteen municipalities have now got their compulsory education system. We are also trying to introduce the system in seventy local bodies. Is this a policy of reaction and is it detrimental to the interests of the country? If hon. Members of this House co-operate with us in carrying out this policy of expanding mass education, we will be able to progress very rapidly and establish practically a national system of elementary education. I want the House to consider whether under the circumstances in which we were placed, financially and otherwise, it would have been possible for any one to do better. Certainly our record is one that anybody can be proud of. The House knows the difficulties under the system of diarchy. When any new proposal is put forward, we have first to convince the departmental head as regards the soundness of the policy. The proposal will then have to be sent to the Secretariat where the history of the matter and its relations with other departments will be considered. Then the matter will be submitted to the Cabinet. After the Cabinet approves of the proposal, it has to go before the hon. the Finance Member. Under

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[27th November 1923]

Devolution Rules 36-39, the hon. the Finance Member has got a potent voice in the matter. He has to finally decide whether it is financially sound or not. However excellent the scheme may be, however appealing it may be, if the hon. the Finance Member does not support the scheme, the whole thing will go to the well. If the hon. the Finance Member accepts the proposal, it will be placed before the Legislative Council which will have to finally sanction it. Thus, when any new principle has to be evolved it takes a long time to complete it. This is unavoidable if we have to work the reforms as they are given to us. We had only two and a half years before us. If we want better results we have to change the rules and regulations. Let us all co-operate and see that the system is altered as early as possible, so that we may progress on more rapid lines and obtain full provincial autonomy. I have told you the difficulties under which we had to work. I will not take up your time in going into the larger issues in connexion with urban areas. Suffice it to say that within the short period of two and a half years that we had, we have done our best. I remember the hon. Member for the University saying at the Gokhale Hall that even if a Brahman Ministry had come into existence, it would not have been possible for them to have done better."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“I was not referring to the particular achievements of this Ministry at all. I was saying that diarchy was unworkable.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I have his speech as reported in the newspapers. He says ‘those of us who are in the Council must work for the day when the Ministry will stand its test. I am not saying that their record is black (that is, the present Ministry). I consider that if the Brahmins had taken office, their record might not have been better because they would have to work under a diarchy which is unworkable.’ This was what the hon. Member for the University spoke at the Gokhale Hall. He throws the blame on the diarchy and the system under which we are working. This shows that he realizes the difficulties under which the Ministers have begun their work. Therefore, I say whatever may be the shortcomings and defects which have been occurred under the circumstances in which we were placed, the total record is quite sufficient to show that we have done our best and followed a progressive policy and not a reactionary policy. The remedy lies in our obtaining provincial autonomy.”

“There are again some 16 points, raised by the hon. Member representing the University, of omission and commission.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Probably the hon. Member may not raise all the 16 points now. The hon. the Minister need not anticipate him and answer all the 16 points, which have not been raised here. The hon. Member may find the atmosphere of this House rather different from that to which he is accustomed.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“As I would not have another opportunity of speaking I wanted to anticipate him. But I bow to your ruling, Sir. As I have already said, there has been no decrease in the number of our party men who have been returned this time. The total strength in the last Council is the same as the total strength now. As for our record, it is impossible for any other Ministry to have done better than

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. P. Patro]

the present Ministry. We have got full sympathy and support the political advancement of the country. We have done our best to improve the condition as it was when we took charge of the office. With regard to the rural areas we have bestowed our best attention to see that the people are more efficient, more capable of relying upon themselves for their advancement. The resolutions passed in the Council to some extent show in what directions progress has been achieved. If we had not been able to go so fast as some Members wish, while I sympathize with them in their desire to move faster, the circumstances under which we were situated did not enable us to go faster. There are certain limitations beyond which we cannot go. I have said what I can say on the various points raised by the hon. Mover and I leave the issue in the hands of the House. This House consists of many new Members, Members who have not yet had opportunities to know what the circumstances were in which we are placed, and what the work of the new Ministry will be, and I would submit to them to wait and see what policy the Ministry is going to follow. If the Ministry follows a reactionary policy, then it will be time enough for them to decide one way or the other. Many have not been directly in contact with the Reforms as worked during the last two and a half years. I only submit to their consideration that we have done our best in carrying on a policy intended for the advancement of the people."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, when I rise at this stage of the debate, I am aware of the difficulties in which I am placed. I know I am coming after the philosophical speech made by the Member who was at the head of Education in Mysore followed by the oratorical speech of the head of Education in Madras. I am aware of the fact that there are going to be several speeches by several hon. Members of the House. The hon. Mover of the resolution referred to various things in support of his motion. I may say that a vote in favour of this resolution does not mean agreement with all the views of the Mover of the resolution and of two others that sit with him.

“Our position to-day is that so far as this Ministry is concerned, i.e., so far as their past record is concerned, whatever may be 1-15 p.m. their future programme, we are not at all satisfied. We shall not be satisfied with the Ministry until and unless the whole attitude of the party is changed. I may once more say that the passing of this motion does not necessarily mean that we mean anything personal against the Ministers who are occupying the front bench. We are here to condemn the procedure and principles that the Justice Party has been pursuing. To begin with, the hon. the Minister in charge of Education said that ‘we are better off now than we were before; Justice Party men defeated non-Justice Party men’. I challenge him to give examples. Are there not examples where the Justice Party men have been defeated by people who belong to other parties? (Cheers.)

“Sir, I remember there was a time in the old Council when attempts were made by some of our non-Brahman friends to form themselves as a separate party called ‘the non-Brahman Independents’ under the leadership of my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar. It collapsed, it failed, thanks to the patronage of the Ministers and thanks to the claims of the Justice Party on people who wanted to belong to other parties. Then, Sir, we tried

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [27th November 1923]

to form an independent opposition consisting of Brahmins and non-Brahmins, but we did not succeed. The Swarajists and the Nationalists do form one strong party in giving opposition to the Ministry. Our friends, the Muhammadans, whom the Justice Party claimed to be their own, have absolutely nothing to do with it. Then how does the hon. the Minister say that 'we are better off after the election than before election'? Let him name half a dozen non-Justice Party men who have been defeated by Justice Party men. I say once again that the Ministry is not having the confidence of this House or of the people outside it. The Ministry is supposed to represent whom?—the Justice Party including the Leader of the Opposition (cheers). I also say once more that, so far as the election result shows, it has proved to the hilt that the Justice Party has lost all confidence that they ever had or that they pretended to have.

"Sir, I shall not base my support for this motion merely on the result of the elections. The result of the elections after all must be considered to have had some connexion—good, bad or indifferent—with the work done by the Ministers. So far as the work of the Reserved half is concerned I am not sensitive to say anything about it. I am not sensitive to say anything even about the work of His Excellency himself. But so far as the Justice Party is concerned, I am sorry to say that His Excellency took a wrong view that that party represented the people of this Presidency. He made a mistake—you will excuse me when I say that—in nominating the Ministers."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Is the hon. Member referring to the present Ministry or to the late Ministry?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"To the present Ministry as judged by the work of the late Ministry (cheers), and what is more the present Ministry as judged by the Justice Party to which they claim to belong. They are in a miserable minority, and are unfortunately strengthened by the nominations which His Excellency the Governor was pleased to make. If the Ministers had been a little more democratic the result of the last three years' working would have been far far different. The hon. the Minister for Education said that the Ministry had only $2\frac{1}{2}$ years for its working. I do not know how many more years are required for the proper working of the Ministry. Assuming that they had only $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, is it such a short period in the history of the country and of the Ministry, in the history of ours, within which the Ministers would not be able to show their good record of work?"

"I do not wish to enter into the communal question which the Justice Party advocates. I am one of those who think that when recruitment for appointments is being made non-Brahmins may reasonably be given a large number of posts provided they are qualified. I am of opinion that the Ministry and the Council committed a serious mistake in overlooking the vested rights of officials already appointed and who had naturally some rights of promotion if they were honest and efficient. I will not press that question very much. I do say that the appointments that have been conferred whether on Brahmins or non-Brahmins, Hindu or Christian or Muhammadan, have been conferred in several cases on persons who are not adequately qualified for such posts, and the hopes and aspirations of those who have already been working in the departments have not been fulfilled and their claims have been overlooked by the Ministers."

27th November 1923]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—" May I ask the hon. Member to give me a few instances ? "

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" I would ask the hon. the Minister to take the lists of appointments made in the various departments and see whether in a number of cases the juniors were not promoted over seniors simply for the reason that the former were non-Brahmans and the latter Brahmins. It may be that many of these non-Brahmans deserved such promotions. However, I only said that we, as a party, do not want communalism to enter into every aspect of public life. My complaint is that bureaucracy has increased. Instead of four bureaucrats before the introduction of the Reforms, we have seven now. Some of us humbly proposed that the pay of the Ministers might be reduced. It was announced last year just on the eve of a general election that a magnificent sum of Rs. 1,000 was reduced in each of the Minister's salary, i.e., from Rs. 5,000 and odd to Rs. 4,000 and odd. It is these Ministers who call themselves democrats. Shall we know how much has been spent on the higher appointments ? The number of appointments has been increased with very largely increased salaries."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—" I must say that it has been in the negative. The cadre was fixed. No appointments were increased."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" I was only going to say that 2,000 and odd clerks were sent away, and I appeal to the gentleman who is the leader of this House. There is no use of pretending that we have dismissed here and there a few hands while the number of higher appointments has increased."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—" There has been a saving of Rs. 1,25,000 in the re-organization of Inspectors of Schools."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" I do not at all refer to personalities. I should simply like to say that in every department, the number of appointments, Imperial or Provincial, has increased."

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—" Sir, I may mention that in the Medical Department a large number of appointments, which have been hitherto held by Indian Medical Service officers, have been thrown open to Provincial Service officers on a smaller pay ? "

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" I am not now saying that these appointments have been given to non-Brahmans or Brahmins or Europeans or Indians. I only state that the number of higher appointments has increased from what it was before the Reforms. We have the sorry spectacle of crores and crores of rupees being spent upon establishments in this Presidency. The Transferred half might say that they are spending only 4 crores upon establishment while the Reserved portion was spending much more than that."

At this stage the Council adjourned for lunch.

The Council re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—" Sir, I am now going to refer to another aspect of the question, that of the reactionary character of the Ministry and their followers during the last three years they were in power. I am not referring to the resolutions that were either tabled, carried or

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [27th November 1923]

thrown out so far as the general administration of the country was concerned. The one thing that the country wants them to explain is their attitude towards the resolution of Mr. Vellingiri Gounder to induce the Minister for Development to encourage hand-spinning and hand-weaving to some extent by introducing these in the schools in our Presidency. The hon. Minister, who was in charge of the department speaking on behalf of the Ministry, thought that it was a step that was likely to drown the whole Presidency in the Bay of Bengal. He was of opinion that, if a small mild form of spinning was introduced in the schools, our children would all become rebels and therefore he opposed it vehemently and with the strength of the Ministerialists it was thrown out.

"Now I come to the question of according better treatment to the political prisoners. Of course this question was dealt with as a Reserved subject, but I have no doubt whatever that the Reserved half might have been made to give a little more consideration to this question if only our Ministers had suggested some compromise between us and the Reserved half. I do not want to say anything more on this question.

"The same thing might be said of the question of separation of executive and judicial functions."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, with regard to the separation of judicial and executive functions, the whole House unanimously agreed to the first proposition, viz., the principle of the separation of judicial and executive functions. There was some other portion in the resolution which was moved by my hon. Friend and it was that which was not accepted. Mr. Tanikachala Chettiar speaking on that resolution said 'we are all unanimously agreed to the principle of separation of judicial and executive functions in the Presidency'."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"My time has been cut down as much as possible by these interruptions and therefore I do not propose to reply to every word that has been said, but if it is a question of order I would reply. I believe what Mr. Tanikachala Chettiar said was different from what the hon. Mr. Patro now says. The hon. Mr. Patro, one of the leading lights of the Congress, one of the leading lights of democracy—at least he said so once, has he moved one finger during the last thirty months he has been in charge of the Excise portfolio, to do anything useful? It may be, he has appointed a committee, a moving committee, a roving committee, to spend a lot of money, to go to different provinces and to produce a report which would throw light where there is no darkness. Has he done anything to reduce the consumption of drink? The only thing that was done was to make a few prostitutes big people by giving them police escort to and from toddy shops."

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. TYAGARAYA CHETTIYAR:—"I did not hear the last word? May I know what it is?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I said that in many of the villages prostitutes were selling toddy."

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN:—"Barmaids."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I shall use the big word 'barmaids'.

27th November 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

“Sir, I and some others on this side tabled resolution after resolution to give some little power to the municipalities to have local option. The resolutions of the municipalities in this matter were thrown to the winds and we see to-day that the income from liquors has gone up by leaps and bounds over what it was three years ago.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“It is not a fact, Sir, that the recommendations of the municipalities or the advice of the licensing committees in the rural areas were thrown to the winds. The report of last year would show that the recommendations of the licensing committees were very much respected and that in a large number of cases their opinions were given effect to.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“Sir, it is a reply and not a point of order. Sir, the Coimbatore municipality by a resolution asked for the removal of certain toddy shops, but the Government refused to accept that resolution.

“I shall now come to the achievements of the Ministry in respect of the Local Boards Amendment Act and the District Municipalities Act. In these Bills they insisted upon every municipal councillor taking the oath. I said then, and I repeat it now, that there was absolutely no meaning in that and that there was absolutely no necessity for such a measure. Has there been a single instance in which the amended Act has had to be put in motion? Has there been a non-co-operator or swarajist who has been affected by that amendment? The hon. the Chief Minister at the time of the passing of the Act said that there would be a number of cases of that sort. But it has not been so. Can he show one case where such power as is taken in that Act has been used in the case of non-co-operators? I am afraid absolutely none. The time of the Council and the money of this country have been wasted in these two pieces of evil legislation. The other achievement of the Ministry is of course the Religious Endowments Act. I do not want to say anything about that. Even those who supported that legislation are now saying that, in spite of the various defects in the Bill, they supported the Bill on account of party unity. They themselves have admitted that there are plenty of defects. Our complaint is that it should not have been treated as a party measure and that it should not have been thrust upon this House at the fag end of the session.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“If I remember aright, Sir, the hon. Member in possession of the House was one of those who congratulated me on passing that Bill.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I congratulated the hon. the Raja of Panagal for having introduced a Bill which gave us an opportunity to discuss the religious endowments in general. But I had warned the party not to consider the Bill as a party measure and not to rush it through.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL:—“The hon. Member had asked for an adjournment for a day and I allowed him three days.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“That does not show that I dotted every ‘i’ and crossed every ‘t’ in that Bill. The hon. the Minister forgets the large number of amendments that were brought to the Bill. That Bill should not have been brought as a party measure and should not have been passed at the fag end of the session.”

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [27th November 1923]

"The hon. Mr. Patro in spite of his $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours' speech has not been able to show any useful work which this Ministry has been able to do. He said that the circumstances were such that they were not able to do much. The House was prepared to support them and still we must say that the whole of the record of the Ministry is practically zero."

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :— "Mr. President, Sir, when I first read the motion tabled by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, 2-45 p.m. I thought it was a motion which called for a searching of one's political conscience and for an examination of the political principles to which one adheres. Now, these are things that cannot be put on or put off like one's dress. They are so much a part of oneself that something more than a mere sentimental objection to a policy or programme, some great dereliction of duty, or some serious objection is necessary to justify a thorough change of political views. I have kept an open mind. I have been all attention to what was said by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, and the other hon. Members who have supported him. I have been looking for some clear, definite policy, general political programme, but beyond a vehement reiteration of some constructive charges that the policy to which the Ministry has been pledged is not sufficiently democratic or progressive, I fail to see any very serious charges, any grave political or economic blunders, such as would justify the moving of a No-confidence resolution. Speaking for the minority which I represent, the main reason why the minority has adhered to the political programme of the Ministerialists is that the Ministerialists stand for the progressive political evolution of this country in co-operation with the Government, crediting them with honesty of intention and purpose, putting faith in the Montague-Chelmsford reforms and regarding them as marking an important stage in well-ordered progress towards Self-Government. That is a programme that appeals to the minorities. It is most practical and business like that one should take existing institutions, the Government which obtains, and by adjustments or by adaptations to new requirements, to new political aspirations, to the growing fitness of the people and to the growing demands made by new democratic ideas and ideals for evolving a new Government without doing violence to the old."

"Side by side with this political programme there is another which is equally important, namely, the economic policy for promoting the prosperity of this province : that encouragement should be given to industries, indigenous industries, and nascent industries, that new industries should be started for which the province is fit and for which there is abundant raw material, that facilities should be afforded for research work, that the talents of Indian youths should be fostered for industrial, technical and commercial pursuits, that their minds should be diverted from purely literary or academic callings into new walks of life which would enable them to contribute more and more to the economic prosperity of this province and also to solve the question of unemployment or of unproductive or unremunerative employments. For this reason I should think that the State Aid to Industries Bill which was passed by this House was a right step in the right direction. This measure, if properly worked out, would certainly result in the economic salvation of this province."

"There is also another point which appeals to minorities. The Ministry is working for the elevation of the politically and socially backward classes.

27th November 1923] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

Now, Sir, in the translation into action of their intentions it might be that they have laid themselves open to criticism ; it might be that in their eagerness to have a majority and to keep the solidarity of their party they have not bestowed sufficient attention on the claims of these minorities and that their interests have not been adequately safeguarded. But human institutions are not perfect and human agencies are not without their imperfections and in especially the practical work of Government, where attention should be paid to the temper, the feelings and passion of the individuals composing the State, difficulties arise and mistakes are made owing to lack of experience or foresight. These are mistakes which admit of being easily rectified. I do not think that they are of such a magnitude as would justify the passing of a 'No-Confidence' Resolution. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, told us that it was a mark of political advancement for the Ministry to take the Vote of Confidence and that it was usually and habitually resorted to at certain stated periods. I think I must differ from him. I should look upon a No-Confidence Resolution as something reserved for an extraordinary occasion, as a weapon to be used on occasions of great emergency. This is what is done in England. When there are certain questions of foreign policy or certain questions of home policy, on which the Ministry is not quite sure of having a clear majority, of carrying the party with it, or on questions like the housing problem or the tariff problem or protection or free trade or labour on which the Ministry would like to have a clear mandate, this means is resorted to. I do not think that we are justified in regarding this No-Confidence Resolution as a sort of test which can be applied under normal conditions.

" Two arguments were made use of by my hon. Friend. First of all, he made an analysis of the election figures and said that it was clear that the Ministry had not a majority. I fear it was rather straining the point. It is true that in elections very many influences are brought into play and one important influence that came into play in this election is that a strong political party which had, on the previous occasion, refrained from contesting the seats of the provincial councils and assemblies had this time made up its mind to enter the councils. Therefore, it was a foregone conclusion that the Ministry was not going to have an overwhelming majority. Now, even granting for argument's sake that the Ministers have not a very large majority, is it not enough for all practical purposes that they have a working majority ? Was it necessary for my hon. Friend Mr. Ramalinga Reddi to table this Resolution of No-Confidence at the beginning of this session when we are in the dark as to the political programme to be followed by this Ministry or by any considerable section of this Council. Can he not have waited for some time and seen the strength of the opposition when certain measures came up for consideration and when certain resolutions were taken up for discussion and then on a definite point of policy, moved this resolution ?

" Secondly, he referred to the way in which Local Self-Government was carried on and he put the blame for mistakes which were found, on the hon. the Chief Minister. He said that discipline was very lax. The complaint has been that discipline was rather very rigid and that municipal chairmen and municipalities wanted to be altogether free from control or dictation. Apart from these considerations, I think the objections raised by my hon.

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar] [27th November 1923]

Friend with regard to this branch of administration may very well be raised against any and every kind of administration. It is easy to offer criticisms, and, if I were to offer criticisms, I should take much of your time and pass in review the past failings of every branch of administration, but it is difficult to substantiate them and fix the blame. We must bear in mind that these are human institutions, that human agencies are at work, and that we have to take into consideration the feelings of the men who form these local bodies. It is necessary that every case should be proved for the head of the department or the hon. Minister in charge to take serious notice of it. My hon. Friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, was just now giving some specific instances where abuses had crept into the Excise administration. I do believe that these are real, and if he would have the courage to prove these instances and bring them to the notice of the local authorities and to the notice of the hon. Ministers, he would thereby enable them to take effective measures for putting a stop to the practices complained of. I think I too have grievances which are of the same nature, but the difficulty is to prove these things to show that the Excise officers abuse their powers and that they do not discharge their duties properly. That is what the law demands; everything has to be proved. It will not do to indulge in general criticisms and say that the entire blame is with the hon. Minister.

"Then, Sir, there is the other question. I do not know what has made hon. Members criticise the policy of the Ministry. I do not attribute any motives to them but judging from the actual work of the Ministry in the Council I think I may be permitted to state that they followed a liberal policy in inviting and meeting criticism. I had the freedom to criticise them and even to oppose them. A motion is now brought forward by my hon. Friend who, I believe, uniformly and consistently supported the Ministry. If they differed from it with regard to certain minor matters and if they thought that the Ministry was not sufficiently progressive, it was open to them to have made their position clear and to have their influence felt in the House. I, for one, never felt this action necessary, and I was never called upon to conceal my views. I had always the courage of opposing the Ministry and when I saw that the Ministry brought forward measures which were calculated to prejudicially affect the interests of the constituency which I represented I did oppose them. On the question of the University Bill my position was very clear. From the moment it was introduced into the House down to the last moment it was passed, I opposed the Bill. But when the majority passed the Bill I had to bow to the will of the majority."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :--" Why ?"

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAYAR :--" That is what is expected of every law-abiding citizen when the majority expresses its will. But if to-morrow certain measures are introduced which would be prejudicial to my constituency I may give the assurance that I would certainly not feel bound to support the Ministry. Before we are asked to vote we must have a clear policy and a clear programme before this House. Who are these who are going to

3 p.m. form the new Ministry, those who are going to help in its formation ? Suppose the present Ministry is defeated, what is to be the political programme of the new Ministry which has to begin its work in this House ? I represent a minority in this House, Sir. What are

27th November 1923] [Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar]

the pledges given by the Members of the Opposition to the minorities? What guarantee is there that their interests will be adequately safeguarded, that their claims will be properly recognized? Where are those pledges, where are those guarantees that we need? In the absence of these, in the absence of a clear knowledge of the constructive programme to be adopted, to ask us to vote against the Ministry is to ask us to take a leap in the dark. I, for one, would not incur the great responsibility of making this wild plunge. I, for one, am not prepared to incur the responsibility of lightly handling a political weapon which, I believe, is to be used only on occasions of grave emergency, when a serious economic or political blunder has been committed attended with serious consequences to the welfare of the nation. I, for one, am not prepared to play at that dangerous game of constitution-mongering and ministry-making, setting up a ministry or abolishing a ministry, for that may land our province in a chaos and ultimately result in the Reforms being rendered unworkable, nugatory and void. In the interests, therefore, Mr. President, of the minorities and in the interests of well-ordered progress and in the interests of that spirit of seriousness which ought to characterise our deliberations, I cannot support this motion. I must necessarily vote against it."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, to my humble mind the issue seems to be a very clear one, although attempts have been made to confuse, so to say, many a new-comer like myself with questions, which I believe, really do not arise. Attempts have been made to show that this proposition, if carried, means disrespect to the head of the Government, probably even to His Majesty the King-Emperor. Attempts have been made to confuse the Members by the issue: 'suppose you vote for this, then what next?'. Attempts have also been made to confuse the Members with the other proposition, namely, what are the constitutional precedents and what are the consequences of carrying such a motion? Mr. President, Sir, I am afraid these are quite unnecessary and irrelevant to the issue. The one question before the House embodied in this proposition is this. The Members are called upon to express the opinion of the electorate upon the administration of the province as carried on by what may be called the party in power during the last three years. Sir, for reasons which need not be entered into here, at the time of the first elections under the Reforms Scheme in 1920 a large body of us stood aloof from the polling booths as well as from the Council. During these three years, Sir, the lives, liberties and privileges of a large section of our people were entrusted to a certain set of people whom for convenience sake we may call the party in power. And to-day, Sir, the motion brought forward by my hon. Friend, Mr. Reddi, gives us a chance to express our opinion on and to review the work that has been done by the Ministry during the last three years. That is the only issue before us and, if we confine ourselves to that, there can be no confusion in the matter.

"Sir, the acts of omission and commission of the Ministry are so fresh in the minds of all present here that they do not require much detailing on my part. It is only a day since we had the privilege of listening to the opening address of the head of the Government in which he laid very proper stress upon the administration of the local institutions. And yet let us see what

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiar] [27th November 1923]

the outgoing Ministry has done for fostering the self-governing institutions. Instances have been given earlier to-day of how in the nomination of District Board Presidentships much partisanship has been shown. In the district which I have the honour to represent, the re-nomination of the District Board President was made, as my hon. Friend has already pointed out, even before the expiry of his term. Why, Sir? Because the elections were taking place at that time. In the district of Tanjore, on the other hand, the place has been allowed to be vacant for five months. Again, Sir, where was the need for the amendment of the Local Boards Act by the insertion of the oath of allegiance? I need not refer to the other harassing interferences with the fostering of local self-government here. Take the case of the village officers, the very foundation of all government. The attempt to interfere with the hereditary nature of the office and the harassment, and inconvenience and other manifold evils caused to that useful lot of people by the system of re-grouping is best seen in the district which I represent."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“It does not refer to the Transferred departments. It is a matter belonging to the Revenue Department.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“Although I am not referring to an act done directly by the Ministers, the public are aware how the ryots were even threatened with the cutting off of the irrigation water. I do not say that the Ministers have done it. But they have never come forward with one word of regret about it. Nor is there an indication that they did not support such a policy. Take again the case of political prisoners. The public cannot forget poor, middle-aged, frail Vasudevayya of Salem grinding out oil under the cool rays of the April sun in the Coimbatore jail compound, or Dr. Varadarajulu Nayudu being asked to grind out the regulation quantity of ragi, and yet the Ministry has gone on unconcerned. Worse than that, remarks came from some of them saying that the usual punishment for felons was not sufficient for politicals. These are only some of the achievements of the Party in power that is now tottering.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, may I know which Minister made that statement?”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, the Leader of the Party which has furnished the Ministry has said it in the most unequivocal terms and it was very widely commented on in the press at that time. Then, Sir, in the matter of the forest grievance, which is one of the most widely felt grievances as the hon. the Deputy President knows, the Ministry has not come forward with any measure of relief to that large body of sufferers who have been so useful in raising a portion of the Viceroy’s salary from behind the plough.

“Well, Sir, I may commit a few mistakes, being new to the place, but I hope I will be pardoned. I wish to say that the Ministry which has been in power has not done anything to earn the confidence of the people. Sir, to add to these, the unsatisfied souls of the Wagon Tragedy cry out for justice. And yet I do not think the Ministerialists have ever come forward to give any word of consolation.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, it is again a Reserved subject. The Ministers have nothing to do with the Mappilla Rebellion or the Wagon Tragedy.”

27th November 1923]

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Excuse me, Sir. It may be a technical blunder and yet, rightly or wrongly, the public associates the Transferred half with such acts.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I believe that section of the public which my hon. Friend represents.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ It may be so, Sir, but I am afraid that it is a large section. Mr. President, these are some of the indications, clear and unmistakable indications, that the Party in power hitherto has not been representing the people’s feelings and the elections have shown very clearly, as has been pointed out on more than one occasion earlier to-day, that the confidence of the people as indicated at the polling stations, has not been with the Ministers. When an attempt is made to perpetuate the same Ministry with a slight modification naturally it is time for the public, for the people whom we have the honour to represent here, to tell the head of the Government that the Ministry does not represent the feelings of the people. I am very sorry that, in giving my support to the Resolution of my hon. Friend, I am wounding many a personal friend. But, Sir, it is my clear duty, my emphatic duty, to associate myself with the Motion before the House. Unconcerned with the politics of my hon. Friend, the Mover, or of his associates, unconcerned equally with the constitutional consequences of the measure, as representing a large body of voters, I give my unstinted support to this Motion.”

Mr. R. VIRAYYAN :—“ Mr. President, Sir, after hearing so many speeches from several of my hon. Friends here I feel it necessary to plead for toleration. I have been listening very carefully, watching very carefully both sides of the question and feel that the Opposition must show a certain amount of toleration. There is no use of criticising the actions of others. I must show that I am free from all defects. It is very easy always to criticise others. But I must show that I am perfect. Before I begin to show that, I have no right to criticise others. Sir, ‘forget and forgive’ is a golden maxim. We should have some amount of toleration. We should also have a genuine sympathy and love towards human society. Only through love we can work wonders. Sir, we should even love our enemies. That is the ideal, and it is with that spirit that we have come here. Unless we learn to tolerate the defects of others, how can we hope to continue to be of good to the public at large ?

“ I should like much to emphasize this.

“ Sir, certainly, I shall be committing a great sin if I fail to voice the feelings of my community on this occasion. Certain members of my community are not given due and adequate representations, and I believe there is a good amount of discontent as regards not giving them greater educational facilities also. I trust the hon. Ministers concerned will give due effect to the sentiments of the depressed, oppressed and neglected classes, and it is for the purpose of voicing the feelings of the Depressed Classes that I have come here. I would be committing a grave sin against Divine law, and a sin from which there is no escape for me, if I do not press the claims of my community. Therefore I should frankly say that the sentiments of my community should be respected. In my opinion, the bird that is actually now in our hands is worth two in the bush. Therefore, I have no hesitation in supporting the existing Ministry. There is some

[Mr. R. Virayyan]

[27th November 1923]

amount of feeling that certain people come to us to persuade us and promise to us that we will all be sent to heaven if we are to follow their lead, but where is the guarantee, Sir, for their doing so? (Laughter and 'hear, hear'.) Whether we will be sent to heaven or hell we do not know. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) Any change may mean worse for our community, and we cannot be fed upon pious hopes. I may repeat once more that we are becoming quite tired, quite deaf, to such promises. For the time being they may come and tell us a lot of things, that they will lift us up to the highest pitch, but where is the guarantee, and where is the assurance that they will act up to their promises? They may say that they will get licences from Providence even for a new status in life. I have no belief in all this. This is why I would support the existing order of things."

MR. ABBAS ALI KHAN:—"Mr. President, Sir, I rise to discharge a most unpleasant duty which has been imposed upon me by the unanimous voice and suffrage of my Muhammadan fellow countrymen in this Council. Sir, when we came into this Council last term, we wanted to form a party of our own, but one of our then members who was our leader, or who chose to call himself the leader, told us that he would get whatever we wanted from the Justice Party, and asked us to help that party. (Hear, hear.) We, after a great deal of deliberation and hesitation, came to the conclusion that a small community like the Muhammadan community, in fact an insignificant minority, should join the Justice Party whose cry from the pulpit and platform has been the elevation of the Depressed Classes, protection of the interests of minorities and pulling down of vested interests which stood in the way of the progress of other communities. The Justice Party, Sir, swore with bell, book and candle that they were out to lift up the Muhammadans to their deserved place and pull down caste Government. The Muhammadans believed them, although the principal communities which formed the Justice Party were only Nayudus, Chettiyars, Mudaliyars and Pillais, and we, after a good deal of hesitation, consented to assist them and made up our mind to join the Ministerial Party. Sir, we entrusted our destinies into their hands, and we committed ourselves entirely to support them. It was a trust which was entrusted to their hands—a sacred trust—and it was their duty to administer that trust honourably and to the satisfaction of the whole Muhammadan community, but not to the benefit of particular communities. What have they done with regard to that trust? Their record is summed up in one word 'cipher', so far as the Muhammadan interests are concerned. I am sorry to say, Sir, that this is the unanimous opinion of our community, and we are going to support the Motion made by Mr. Ramalinga Reddi to-day. Very well, Sir, we supported the Ministry strongly for three years. I have been a Member of this House for the last three years, and I cannot recall any one instance where a Muhammadan has been nominated to a high place by the Ministry. Is this not acting contrary to the principles of the Party? Sir, in many instances the Muhammadans were asked to give their entire support. For instance, in regard to the Religious Endowments Bill, we gave our full support to the Bill because we were assured that the hon. the Raja of Panagal would see that our interests would not be touched. And in view of that assurance, we, Muhammadans, though as a body we were inclined to strict neutrality, yet, on account of his persuasions and in support of the Party principles, we voted for the Bill. And for the sake of Party principles we

27th November 1923]

[Mr. Abbas Ali Khan]

effaced ourselves. The hon. Mr. Patro was aware what the attitude of the Muhammadans was going to be. I expect to be enlightened as to what he has done for the Muhammadan community so that it may feel proud of him."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, if he searches the appointment lists in every department in my charge, he will find that Muhammadans have been encouraged in every way.”

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :—“ Sir, the Civil List will show whether he has discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the Muhammadans or not. That satisfaction has been long delayed, and it may be delayed for years. Then again, we find that wherever Muhammadans wanted anything the reply has been that the party wanted to benefit their own people. At one time though we were small in numbers, we were considered to be politically so important that in every department we had our due share. But to-day where are we? What is our position? We are absolutely nowhere. We are absolutely denied high appointments in the public services. Even among non-officials, there is no single district board presidentship given to a Muhammadan even in districts with large Muhammadan populations. In Bellary where there are more than 30 members there is only one Muhammadan nominated. Recently four vacancies occurred among the nominated members, and all the four have been filled up by non-Muhammadans. In Madura out of 40 or 50 district board members, only three are Muhammadans. But whenever we asked for representation, the Ministers and their party have always been anxious to secure nominations to other communities who were said to share the views of the Justice Party. I have found from actual experience that whenever the question of appointments came in, they always preferred a Mudaliyar, a Nayudu, a Chettiyar or a Pillai but not a Muhammadan (hear, hear). The Muhammadans have always found that when this process of elimination was over, there was nothing left for them. When the Muhammadans ask for anything, the reply is ‘நாளைக்கு’ and this நாளையதினால் will never come. That has been our fate for the last three years. For three years we have been ignored and neglected, and after trying the Ministry for three years, the Muhammadan community which has been silently and unobtrusively watching their actions, their sins of commission and omission, without voice or protest, has found that the Ministry have done nothing and to-morrow the Muslim community is going to give its verdict for them. That is how the Ministry has discharged the trust entrusted into its hands by a community which has loyally, staunchly and religiously supported the Ministry ! ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, may I rise to explain a point? It is the question of appointments referred to by the hon. Member. They are not in the hands of the Ministers. Appointments of non-gazetted officers and appointments below a certain rank are in the hands of the heads of departments. The appointments to gazetted offices and the higher services are in the hands of the Governor.”

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :—“ I am talking, Sir, of appointments or nominations to taluk boards, district boards and other local bodies.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Well, Sir, due representation has been given to the Muhammadan community in all the boards where the nominations are made by the Government.”

[27th November 1923]

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :—“ You will derive satisfaction from the unanimous verdict of 13 members against you. Again, I ask what is their number to-day ? Further, as regards appointments in the Transferred departments we find that almost all appointments have been given to caste Hindus who were said to be in a minority. That is again a charge which I make, and I am prepared to substantiate it if there is time enough for me to-day. Is not the Muhammadan community a community that has stood by the Ministry, when they were in trouble, when their party was threatened with destruction ? And yet what has been done for them ? Four of us who were members of the old Council have now been returned to this House, and how comes it that our attitude is now different and changed ? We are not Swarajists ; we are not out for wrecking the constitution. We have got our own grievances, we have got our own motions to bring forward, and we think, and rightly think, that we would gain nothing by supporting a party which has done nothing for us in the past. Sir, the Muhammadan members of all the constituencies in the Presidency are determined to stand by themselves and organise themselves into a party as early as possible, and for this purpose we convened a meeting and decided to form a party of our own, so that we may march forward putting our trust in our cause in God and in ourselves, and not put our faith in this party or that party (cheers). We want to fight our own battles, and it is my hope that if the thirteen Muhammadan members present a united front, they will succeed better ; so we are going to present a united front and it will be found that they are not such as the hon. Mr. Patro described them.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I did not mean that Muhammadans are such people as my hon. Friend describes them to be.”

Mr. ABBAS ALI KHAN :—“ The Muhammadans that have now come to this Council are clearly seeing only one thing, and that is three years of neglect and three years of disappointment. I would ask hon. Members to pause and consider carefully why the Muhammadan community that stood by them right loyally in all their actions should now observe hostility towards the Justice Party and vote against the continuance of their Ministry. I would also ask all the parties, the Swarajists, Independents, anti-Ministerialists and others, to join together and vote for no-confidence. In some places, Sir, for instance, in the Ceded Districts we find in regard to the appointments of Assistant Registrars of Co-operative Societies, Assistant Inspectors of Schools and other higher appointments, they are always given to the party men, Nayudus or Mudaliyars, and the Muhammadans are only thrown a few crumbs here and there. And if I ask what the Ministry have done for the Muhammadan community for the last three years, it may be replied ‘ We have appointed four Knights ’. But in the matter of other appointments, i.e., in the Public service, we find that even if an old Tahsildar who is a Muhammadan is promoted, he is shown as having been conferred a new appointment. I do not want to waste any more the time of this Council, and there are several other hon. Members anxious to speak. I only want to say this much, that we Muhammadans in this House want to show to this Presidency and the whole country that we are determined to stand by ourselves and repose trust in our cause and our God, but not this particular party, and I would ask hon. Members to vote for the Motion.”

27th November 1923]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“Sir, I will only say one or two words on this resolution. I must oppose this resolution. 3-30 p.m. We have been hearing a great deal recently not only in this Presidency, but throughout India about the Indianization of the services. I believe that the Madras Ministry has done more for Indianization of services than the Ministries in other parts of the country. It is during the tenure of office of the Madras Ministry that an Indian was for the first time appointed as the Chief Engineer. It was again during the tenure of this Ministry that an Indian was appointed for the first time as the head of the Health Department. So far as I am aware, no similar appointments have been made in any other part of India. Then again, Sir, there was a large number of highly-paid appointments which were reserved exclusively for officers of the Indian Medical Service. A large number of these appointments—I believe about 22 or so in number—have on account of the exertions of the hon. the Raja of Panagal been thrown open to the officers of the Provincial Service. This by itself, I consider, is an achievement.

“I would like to refer, Sir, to one constitutional aspect of this question. I wish to draw the attention of my hon. Colleagues to the serious consequence that will ensue if this Resolution be carried and that is this. What will be the result if the resolution of my valued friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, be accepted by this House? The inevitable consequence will be that the existing Ministry will fall and another Ministry will be installed in its place. Now, Sir, having regard to the constitution of this House, can there be any doubt that the Ministry which will be installed in the place of the present Ministry will also have only a very short lease of life? Some of our friends here in this Council, if I understand my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar correctly, are likely to oppose any Ministry that is likely to come into power, and if the Ministry which is installed in the place of the present Ministry also falls, a third Ministry—also a new one—will come into power to be knocked down again very soon. And what will be the consequence, Sir, I ask my hon. Colleagues of this Council, if we go on playing at this game of making Ministries and knocking them down? What will be the consequence if the inquiry contemplated under the Government of India Act in 1929 or, as many of us wish, at an earlier date comes to be undertaken? To my mind there can be only one consequence. And that will be that we the people of this country shall be found unfit for Self-Government. That will be the inevitable result. I do not want to be a prophet, but I am almost certain that that will be the conclusion of the Committee that will be appointed in 1929. My friends may differ from me, but that is my opinion. If that be the case, the day when we shall have dominion status will be put off for a long time. I feel confident that my friend Mr. C. R. Reddi and many of those who think with him on this resolution are of opinion that, in spite of the defects and blemishes of these Reforms, there are some good points in them, and I am also certain that my friend and many of us want to work these Reforms to the best advantage. I ask my friend, does he think that if this resolution be carried, the result will be the working out of these Reforms to the best advantage? I believe not. I believe, Sir, that this point is one which should be seriously taken into consideration by my hon. Colleagues of this Council before they vote upon this resolution. For this constitutional aspect, if not for anything else, I am going to vote against my friend’s resolution.”

[27th November 1923]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“ Mr. President, Sir, it is with very great pleasure that I rise to support this Resolution. But, I sincerely regret, Mr. President that my maiden speech in this House should be on such a highly controversial question. I should have very much wished that I should have been privileged to speak on the first occasion in this House, on a much less controversial question, which would not rouse passions, on one side, or the other. But I find the situation as it is, and I have got to make the best of it.

“ In supporting this Resolution, I have only to draw the attention of some of the hon. Members of this House that this Resolution enunciates but two bare statements of fact, first, that the present Ministry as now constituted is against the verdict of the country as given in the last general elections, and, secondly, that it does not command the confidence of this House. If hon. Members are satisfied on these two statements of fact, I beg of them to vote for this Resolution irrespective of the political views of the person or persons who are the sponsors of this Resolution.

युक्तियुक्तं वचो ग्राह्यं वालादपि शुकादपि ।

“ It does not matter to us what the political views of the hon. Mover of this Resolution are or are not. The only question for every honest Member here to answer, not according to individual predilections, but according to the views of the electorate whom he represents here, is whether we want this reactionary Ministry, which has sat as a nightmare for the last two-and-a-half years upon the public of this Presidency, to continue in power. If we are satisfied that the electorate does not want it, I am certain, Mr. President, that our duty is to vote in favour of this Resolution.

“ My hon. Friend from Malabar raised terrors of what might happen to us if that calamity befalls us and this Ministry is defeated. My humble answer to that, Sir, is this :

देशो विशालः प्रभवोप्यनन्तः

“ These three Ministers do not exhaust the possibility of all Ministerial talent in this Presidency. There will be other people coming forward to take their place and may I suggest that, even according to my Malabar Friend, they are not the last word in Ministerial perfection? But there is another matter, and that is with regard to the Malabar Tenancy Bill. I leave it to my Friend and his constituents who are so anxious about the Malabar Tenancy Bill to settle as to how he will be able to introduce the Bill and win for it the enthusiastic support he wishes to have, when it was only the other day, that it was declared in a public meeting that the Ministry would not support the Bill.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ May I say one word of personal explanation, Sir? I, together with some of my friends from Malabar who are Members of this Council, had a conversation on this subject of the Malabar tenancy with the hon. the Raja of Panagal and he has given us an assurance that he is in favour of the principles of the Bill, viz., the grant of occupancy right to cultivating tenants.”

27th November 1923]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I am very glad indeed, Sir, that I have been the instrument of getting the hon. the Chief Minister committed—I see he does not contradict me yet—to the principle of Mr. Krishnan Nayar’s Bill.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. the Raja of Panagal cannot be said to have committed himself, simply because of a conversation across the floor of the House between Mr. Satyamurti and Mr. Krishnan Nayar.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Well, Sir, you have left it in such a delightfully vague way and I am content to leave it there, and I need not pursue it further. But the point I want to urge upon this House is that the present Ministry as now constituted is exactly the same as the old one. The hon. the Education Minister in his somewhat excited and broken English told us for one hour this morning the various principles of responsibility which ought to govern the actions of Ministers in this House. He referred us to section 52 of the Government of India Act. May I refer him and the hon. Members of this House to an important paragraph in the Joint Committee Report of the House of Lords and the House of Commons who considered this Bill in which they enunciated in the most unambiguous terms the principle of collective responsibility of Ministers under the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms ? This is what the Joint Committee say : ‘ They think that it should be recognized from the commencement that Ministers may be expected to act in concert together. They probably would do so and in the opinion of the Committee it is better that they should.’ I therefore put it to the House that the Joint Committee which is the most competent authority to pronounce upon the matter, has made the hon. the Education Minister responsible for the acts of commission and omission of the last Cabinet. He cannot ride off on this principle of individual responsibility of the Ministers. It is a negation of all responsible government and I do hope that it will not appeal to the hon. Members of this House. I do not propose to follow the hon. Mr. Patro in his many charges against the Opposition. But there is one statement which he made and I hope the hon. the Law Member will answer him when his turn comes and he speaks. The hon. the Education Minister said ‘ we all know how elections are manipulated.’ Now, Sir, I know our constituencies are not perfect, the franchise is not as wide as it ought to be ; but still I am yet to learn that the Government or any body else in any manner manipulates the elections. Perhaps the hon. the Education Minister knows more than I do. If he does, he will tell the House. But, so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly certain that these elections have not been manipulated.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ What I meant was, manipulated by candidates by all sorts of influence being brought to bear at the elections.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I know the hon. the Minister for Education himself did so and many others also did so, but they manage to forget it when they come to this House. The hon. the Education Minister told us with great pride that during the last two and a half years they have succeeded in increasing the expenditure under the various Transferred heads by the glorious sum of 2 per cent. Now, Mr. President, I hope it will be conceded by everybody in this House that the expenditure on the Transferred departments can easily be doubled and ought to be doubled to the great

[Mr. S. Satyamurti] [27th November 1923]

advantage of the people of this Presidency. If, therefore, the present rate of progress is continued and the Ministry also continues in office, it will take, say, more than fifty years before we can get that standard of expenditure in the Transferred departments. If the Ministerial half is satisfied with that rate of expenditure, may I say that some of us here are not satisfied with that pace?"

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I referred, Sir, to the allocation of the provincial revenues that was made before the Reforms and what we gained during the two and a half years."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I should have expected, Mr. President, the rate to have gone much higher than that. I am not so easily satisfied with the rate of progress and that is why I said that at the rate of 2 per cent for two years, it will take us fifty years to get to the required standard of expenditure.

"Mr. President, I will not follow my hon. Friend, the Christian Member from Trichinopoly, who has appealed to us to forgive our enemies. It is a Christian virtue to be practised elsewhere; but when we face political parties here, we have got to remember our electorate and not to develop sudden sentimental considerations that those who are in power must for ever continue in power, lest we offend their sentiments. Ministries might go, Ministries might come. And unless we are going to act in a Christian spirit of charity, and say that all that is best, and that we ought not to lay profane hands on the Ministers, we ought not to swerve from our duty, by this homily on Christian charity towards the Ministers, whatever their acts of commission or omission may have been in the past.

"Sir, on the constitutional question of the introduction of a new Minister, I want to say one thing. My position is this, Sir. I would ask the hon. the Chief Minister to contradict me if I am wrong. I take it the Governor in this constitution with reference to the Transferred departments occupies the position of a constitutional Monarch in a responsibly governed country. The King can do no wrong. So the Governor can do no wrong with regard to the Transferred departments. Every action of His Excellency is governed by the advice of the Ministers. When the hon. the Chief Minister and the Leader of the party were jointly invited by His Excellency to give him advice with regard to the formation of the Ministry, what was the advice they gave him? They owe it to this House to state it. It is not a matter of a private conversation. They are elected by the people and they are bound to state what the advice was. Why did they want to sacrifice a colleague of theirs for no fault of his, and how did they find that the opinion of this House would favour a Ministry with a Tamilian, and did they give that advice? I know that they should have given advice, and that is why they were sent for. Were they sent for merely to be told that His Excellency had made up his mind? I challenge the hon. the Chief Minister, who is yet to answer to this debate, to say what is the advice he gave and why he sacrificed one Minister to whom the hon. the Minister for Education paid a passionate tribute of respect for the work he had done in connexion with the co-operative societies. May I ask the hon. the Chief Minister to say"

27th November 1923]

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Mr. President, I am afraid, Sir, that with due deference I should point out to my hon. friend, the Member for the University, that the interpretation of the constitutional law he has given is not quite correct. He says that the Governor is more or less in the position of a Monarch. He really is not in the position of a Monarch alone. But in him are combined both the Premiership as well as the Crown.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I will not take my lessons in constitutional law from the hon. the Raja of Panagal. I have read the Government of India Act, I have read the report of the Joint Parliamentary Committee, and I can understand them as well as he. The Governor in an Indian province with regard to the Transferred departments does not occupy the position of the Premier and the King, but he is a mere King, and I do not think that the hon. the Chief Minister can so easily seek to share with His Excellency Lord Willingdon the responsibility of his administration for the last three years.”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ In every act of the Ministry, the Governor is expected to be acting with the Ministers, whereas the English Monarch does not bind himself to the actions of the Ministers. That is the difference.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ So far as the constitutional position is concerned, it is up to hon. Members to each hold his own opinion. The House is not, however, called upon to decide this question.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ With regard to another matter, however, on which the point is absolutely free from doubt, i.e., as to how a new Ministry or an old Ministry after the elections ought to face this House, I have the high authority of Mr. Tood, and I will just read two sentences of his which will convince this House : ‘ The verdict of the country having been pronounced against the Ministers at a general election (and I submit that the case here is *a fortiori*) it is nevertheless competent for them to remain in office, until the new Parliament has met and given a definite and final decision upon their merits. For the House of Commons is the legitimate organ of the people, whose opinions cannot be constitutionally obtained except through their representatives in Parliament. It is necessary, however, that under such circumstances the new Parliament should be got together without delay’. Now, Sir, all these conditions prevailed in Madras ; a motion for a vote of ‘ No-confidence ’ had been tabled ; the House was meeting in a few days ; so it was perfectly open to the hon. the Chief Minister to come here with his old Cabinet and face the music and take the verdict of the House. I challenge him to tell me what are the channels, secret or public, by which he found out the opinion of this House that they would not tolerate the hon. Mr. K. V. Reddi but that they would tolerate the hon. Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai in his Ministry.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ That is a matter of detail. Was not the Motion tabled after Mr. Sivagnanam Pillai’s appointment ? Mr. C. R. Reddi will be able to enlighten us.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ It was technically tabled after the appointment. But I gave notice of my intention to do so in case the Raja of Panagal continued to be the Chief Minister.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ To whom was the notice given ?”

[27th November 1923]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ In a public speech.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Oh ! That is a different matter.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I accept your correction, Sir. But it was in the newspapers, and I find from the hon. the Education Minister’s protests in his speech that Ministers are not reading newspapers (laughter). If they had read newspapers, they should have known that this Motion is going to be tabled. To say that it was not technically tabled is something which we cannot swallow so easily. Now the position is that, so far as the present Ministry is concerned, it is exactly the same as the old Ministry. They have not told us whether they have a new policy. It is the same old reactionary policy which has produced nothing, and which is likely to produce nothing, but which has so led the Council as to betray its trust to the country.

“ The hon. the Minister for Education gave away the whole case when he said that the Ministry did not put forward any candidates. Has any one ever heard in any country with Parliamentary institutions, of any Ministry which wants to be in power and which goes to the electorate, bankrupt of policy, bankrupt of programme, and bankrupt of candidates and comes back to the House, stretches its net wide, to trap in new recruits and then says ‘ we are the party in power ’ ? ”

The hon. Rao Babadur A. P. PATRO :—“ What I said was that when there were two non-Brahman candidates who were working with us, standing for the election, we did not want to support either of them because both of them were friends.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ The point is that the Ministry dared not put forward and did not put forward a sufficient number of candidates before the electorate. Why, Sir, in the City of Madras, which is supposed to be the stronghold of the Justice Party, they put forward only three candidates for four seats, one of whom was ignominiously defeated and the other two came second and third. My figures of the voting are these, Mr. President: the votes cast in favour of anti-Ministerialists including the Independents and Swarajists in the general electorate excluding Muhammadans and Christians, is 303,755 ; and the Votes cast in favour of the Ministerialist candidates is 145,554. I know that Ministers can manipulate things as they please after the elections. People have been changing their minds after the elections. Might I implore in all humility that theirs is a sacred trust not to be exchanged for mutual compliments or smiles ? The question is : in what garb did they face the electorate ? That is the garb that you ought to wear in this Council, in spite of the Ministerialist frowns or smiles. I say to this House that we have defeated the Ministry hollow in the elections, whatever they might say now.

“ So this Ministry being the same as the old, it is our bounden duty to examine the record of this Ministry, and if the record does not command the confidence of this House, it is the duty of the House to pronounce its verdict against this Ministry and support this motion. Before I go to enumerate a few particular acts of commission or omission—I want to mention only a few of them—I should like to suggest to this House that for the last three years this House has not been allowed to be a faithful echo of the pulsating life of the nation in this Presidency, as in any other part of this country. All new impulses were shut out, and a reactionary policy was put

27th November 1923] [Mr. S. Satyamurti]

into force, and any man who dared to get up and say something progressive, national or patriotic, was laughed out as an eccentric man who has no place in this Council which was against all progress.

"I only now want to say a few words on a few specific charges which the hon. the Minister for Education wants to answer. With regard to the treatment of political prisoners, the matter has been already referred to. I want in this connexion to respectfully remind the Reserved half that I am not encroaching on them at all now, although I may have to pick some bones with them later. To-day my object in saying what I say is that the Transferred half, whatever the policy of the Reserved half may have been with regard to the political prisoners, did nothing, but that the old Leader of the party in power who has called upon the Almighty God to protect him . . ."

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. TYAGARAYA CHETTI :—“ May I ask the protection of the President ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am not able to catch the hon. Member.”

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Tyagaraya Chetti was observed to say something inaudible from his seat without rising.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ If the hon. Member wants to say anything, he should stand up and address me.”

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. TYAGARAYA CHETTI :—“ This gentleman is just attacking me, and I wanted your protection.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Mr. President, may I expect to be addressed according to the usual practice in this House ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Mr. Satyamurti will proceed.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I was referring to the speech delivered by the hon. the Leader of the Party, who is anxious to proclaim from the housetops that he was still functioning as the King along with the Chief Minister, that he so far forgot his age, his sense of chivalry, his sense of political right thinking, as to say in this House that political prisoners should be treated worse than dacoits and robbers. Surely it is up to the members of this House . . . ”

Diwan Bahadur Sir P. TYAGARAYA CHETTI :—“ I said so and I say so even now.” (Tremendous cries of ‘Shame, shame’).

At this stage, the cries of ‘Shame, shame’ were observed to have emanated also from the strangers’ gallery just above the President’s chair, and the hon. the President therefore ordered the police to clear the gallery immediately.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I am very glad that the hon. the Leader of the Party has come out in his true colours, and I appeal to him and to my hon. Friends who follow him to lay their hands on their hearts and say this, as before God, whether they can support a party whose head says categorically that political prisoners are worse than dacoits and robbers. Surely, Sir, it is up to you Mr. President to say that the members of this House should remember that they owe a duty to the electorate, and after all there is an end to everything, and even to this Council. Three years later, they will have to answer this question to the electorate, and I will ask them in all humility before they make up their minds whether they would not

60 MOTION FOR AN ADDRESS TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR
REGARDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE MINISTRY

[Mr. S. Satyamurti] [27th November 1923]

hesitate twice, aye, many times, before they subscribe to such a reactionary policy with regard to political prisoners, and whether a party with such a dangerous policy with regard to political prisoners is worthy of a civilized country.

"Then, Sir, I was particularly privileged to listen to the eloquent speech of my hon. Friend who spoke as a depressed classes representative. He said that he would gladly have a bird in the hand rather than two in the bush. I am afraid human memory is short (laughter). I would remind him and the other hon. Members of this House of what Mr. M. C. Raja said as a Member of this House. He said that the process of a non-Brahman oligarchy perpetuating itself in office ignoring the claims of the depressed classes has come to pass. But my hon. Friend is a new Member and he does not know the ways of the Justice Party, and when he does he will regret the speech he has made to-day. 'The attitude of the party'"

Mr. R. VIRAYYAN:—"I stick to my statement."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I understand the hon. Member to say that he sticks to his statement. It is presumed that every hon. Member when he says anything will stick up to it (laughter). An interruption of that sort is wholly out of order."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Then, Sir, their attitude with regard to the resettlement of revenue in districts requires examination. With regard to one district, it had to be postponed; with regard to another district, they went back on that. Again I say to the Reserved half that I am not dealing with the position which the Government as a whole took up with regard to this question, but with that of the Ministry, who did not speak out the mind of the people. If they had, I am not going to say what the Reserved half might or might not have done. But did the Ministers express their opinion as they ought to have done? They trifled with this question and to-day they want that they should be continued in power. In Tanjore, Sir, which is the district most affected by the resettlement, for none of the three seats did the three Ministerialists dare to show their faces before the electorate; they ran like rats into their holes. There Swarajists gained the day, and that is an eloquent testimony to the position of the Ministerialists, as to whether they deserve to continue in power or not. Besides this, however, there were three capital issues, Sir, on which the Ministry might have asserted itself. But did they? This House, Sir, was fretting and fuming with regard to the iniquitous impost of the provincial contribution, and passed a unanimous resolution that the contribution should be cancelled. If I had the leadership of the party in power, and if I had the majority in the House, I would have asked the Ministers to resign, would have compelled a dissolution and shown to the Government of India how strong the feeling in Madras was in the matter. But the Ministers stuck to their posts like leeches, whatever happened, and the Government of India flouted them and they took it lying down.

"Then, Sir, there is one other matter which I want the Ministers to explain if they can. The hon. Mr. Moir, as the official Member representing Madras in the Legislative Assembly, said with regard to the proposed raising of the salt duty to Rs. 2-8-0 a maund that responsible opinion in Madras supported that step. I want the Ministers to give to this House a full and accurate account of the negotiations which took place at that time."

[Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiar] [27th November 1923]

the outgoing Ministry has done for fostering the self-governing institutions. Instances have been given earlier to-day of how in the nomination of District Board Presidentships much partisanship has been shown. In the district which I have the honour to represent, the re-nomination of the District Board President was made, as my hon. Friend has already pointed out, even before the expiry of his term. Why, Sir? Because the elections were taking place at that time. In the district of Tanjore, on the other hand, the place has been allowed to be vacant for five months. Again, Sir, where was the need for the amendment of the Local Boards Act by the insertion of the oath of allegiance? I need not refer to the other harassing interferences with the fostering of local self-government here. Take the case of the village officers, the very foundation of all government. The attempt to interfere with the hereditary nature of the office and the harassment, and inconvenience and other manifold evils caused to that useful lot of people by the system of re-grouping is best seen in the district which I represent."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“It does not refer to the Transferred departments. It is a matter belonging to the Revenue Department.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“Although I am not referring to an act done directly by the Ministers, the public are aware how the ryots were even threatened with the cutting off of the irrigation water. I do not say that the Ministers have done it. But they have never come forward with one word of regret about it. Nor is there an indication that they did not support such a policy. Take again the case of political prisoners. The public cannot forget poor, middle-aged, frail Vasudevayya of Salem grinding out oil under the cool rays of the April sun in the Coimbatore jail compound, or Dr. Varadarajulu Nayudu being asked to grind out the regulation quantity of ragi, and yet the Ministry has gone on unconcerned. Worse than that, remarks came from some of them saying that the usual punishment for felons was not sufficient for politicals. These are only some of the achievements of the Party in power that is now tottering.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, may I know which Minister made that statement?”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“Sir, the Leader of the Party which has furnished the Ministry has said it in the most unequivocal terms and it was very widely commented on in the press at that time. Then, Sir, in the matter of the forest grievance, which is one of the most widely felt grievances as the hon. the Deputy President knows, the Ministry has not come forward with any measure of relief to that large body of sufferers who have been so useful in raising a portion of the Viceroy’s salary from behind the plough.

“Well, Sir, I may commit a few mistakes, being new to the place, but I hope I will be pardoned. I wish to say that the Ministry which has been in power has not done anything to earn the confidence of the people. Sir, to add to these, the unsatisfied souls of the Wagon Tragedy cry out for justice. And yet I do not think the Ministerialists have ever come forward to give any word of consolation.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, it is again a Reserved subject. The Ministers have nothing to do with the Mappilla Rebellion or the Wagon Tragedy.”

[Mr. A. P. Patro] [27th November 1923]

the party stood with the hon. the Mover, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, who wanted not to press it to a division but only wanted to elicit a discussion on it. He was entirely satisfied with the nature of the opinions expressed by the party and others representing the Ministry. That is not therefore the fault of the Ministry. A reading of the report will clearly show what the state of matters was, viz., that the hon. Mover said that he is perfectly satisfied with the views expressed on the debate and that he did not want to press it to a division."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I think the whole position is perfectly wrong—"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think we are plunging into a discussion of what took place in this Council some time back. I believe the proceedings are printed and copies given to all hon. Members. And I would propose to let them read the proceedings and verify the facts." (Laughter).

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, you have given it a delightful turn and I will leave it there. I plead guilty to the charge of being a newspaper politician. But I am confident that I shall now begin to improve as I have begun to hear political harangues from the hon. the Education Minister. But I repeat my charge that by not giving a lead to the House and by abdicating his functions on a matter of this kind, the Minister has failed to discharge his duty on this matter. Either he had no ideas on the matter or he had not the courage to express them."

"The other achievement of the Minister which I want to refer to is the appointment of Selection Committees to the Government Colleges. In this matter I speak not as a Brahman, but as an Indian. For the last two and half years we have been talking in this House, as if we were Brahmans and non-Brahmans and Christians. I think I am right, Mr. President, in saying that when once we cross the doors of this House we are no longer Brahmans, non-Brahmans or anything of the sort, but Indians, and ought to transcend all harness of caste and creed. Speaking as a Member of this House, as an Indian, in all humility I protest against this nefarious attempt to deny the benefits of education to a section of the people because they have the misfortune of being born in a particular community. I perfectly agree that such facilities as are necessary ought to be provided to all classes of His Majesty's subjects. If they did not find funds for doing so, this House surely would have gladly voted more funds for more colleges for boys and girls who come to receive education, but to say you shall not come in because you belong to a particular community is a dangerous precedent and inconsistent with the high principles of democracy. As a result of all this, education though it has been transferred, has remained in the same old bureaucratic rut; no national life has been infused into it and the bureaucratic machinery has remained unchanged except that an Indian has been getting the five thousand rupees which might have been paid to a European; no other change has been made.

"I want to conclude by saying a word about the Chief Minister. His achievements form the main point of the impeachment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Reddi. With regard to the Religious Endowments Bill, I do not want to enter into the merits of this Bill; but I know that in no country except in India a measure of this kind would have been introduced, unless it had been placed as a definite issue before the electorate in an election. But the Minister's

27th November 1923] [Mr. S. Satyamurti]

sense of loyalty to the electorates was so great that he began to burst out when he was asked to postpone it till after the new elections. He said 'if the elections were to intervene during the pendency of the Bill, I am afraid those who are reported to be not very scrupulous as to how they use the trust funds would have an opportunity to try to tamper with the electorate and the result will be disastrous to the interests of these unfortunate institutions.' I forgive him because he does not know what he is talking about. The Chief Minister has no acquaintance with any electorates whatever. He carries about him his small electorate in his pocket consisting of 65 people, of whom only 39 voted for him. Therefore, I can understand his ignorance of electors. But speaking as one who has been returned by a wide and democratic electorate, may I resent this charge of the possibility of corruption on the part of the elector? And I ask the Chief Minister to say if the sequel, when the Bill had remained pending the election, has not shown that his charge was baseless. Will he have the fairness to withdraw that?

" Next with regard to his achievements relating to the Chirala Municipality. It ranks with the most bureaucratic achievements of any bureaucratic administration in Madras. He said 'there are people who are against a Municipality, but they do not know what they want.' I thought, Sir, the Reforms were intended to make people for the first time realize their duties. Mr. Montagu and Lord Chelmsford have set it down in their report that the only way of making people realize their responsibilities is to let them commit mistakes and reap the results of those mistakes. But the Minister wanted still to play the Mabap 'father and mother' to the unfortunate people of Chirala by telling them 'you do not know what is good for you; I know because, I am Providence; therefore I will force a municipality upon you.' I want to know if this is the type of Minister whose very conception of Local Self-Government is so primitive that is going to be useful for the people.

" The last thing about the Chief Minister is this. There was a great man in the Tamil nadu by name Bharathi. If he was only born in England he would have been made the Poet Laureate; his songs are so elevating and patriotic. The hon. the Law Member himself knows them and he will bear me out when I say that these songs are some of the most moving in our language and still when the Tinnevelly Taluk Board introduced the teaching of these songs in the schools under their management, the hon. the Chief Minister's anger was roused and he saw revolution in those songs. Is he the Minister who is going to guide the future destinies of the local boards and municipalities and the education and discipline of the boys and girls of the schools under their management? His party has no political programme, has no political faith, has no political opinions. It depends for its existence upon party bias and upon the bogie of the Brahman. I have the honour to belong to a party which does not care for the loaves and fishes of office. We realize the truth of the Upanishadic saying *न कर्मणा न प्रज्ञया धनेन त्यगेनैकेन अमृतत्वमानशुः*. Some of us at least hope that we may rise to that level. We do not want the loaves and fishes of office. We believe one can best serve our country by remaining out of office at least for some years.

[Mr. S. Satyamurti] [27th November 1923]

" We support this motion, because we believe that in the best interests of this Presidency this clique of office-hunters which has been masquerading as a political party should no longer be allowed to poison the very springs of public life and should be replaced by a patriotic and non-communal Ministry.

" The question, however, has been asked 'What will happen if this 4-15 p.m. resolution is carried?' In principle what will happen is that the constitution of this Ministry will change altogether. And whoever the new Ministers may be, there is no doubt whatever that, once the breach is effected in this phalanx of communalism, there is every probability of the breach becoming wider and wider. I do not take the hon. Mover's threat seriously, viz., that whatever may happen there should for ever be a communal Ministry. Let us not lose heart. For even in this matter he is not omnipotent. Any Ministry which comes will have to put forward most necessarily a well-thought-out programme before the country. I appeal to the country to demand that programme. We are now condemning the Ministry and asking the House to vote in such a way that they should go out of office. To say that before you ask me to do that, you will have to produce a programme which will satisfy me simply shows that you are content with the present Ministry as it is. If you are so, please do not ride off on the side issue that you will not support the motion, unless you produce something better. The present Ministry is so bad, that nothing can be worse. We, therefore, as members of the Swarajya Party, support this motion; and I may say this in conclusion that though we are absolutely indifferent as to the fate of this motion, we are certain that if honesty and good sense were to prevail in this House and if Members have no axes of their own to grind, this motion would be carried by a large majority of this House. I already see the hand of death upon this Ministry. It is not permanent. It is bound to die. When this Ministry dies, it will die, unwept, unhonoured, and unsung." (Loud cheers.)

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" I regret I shall not be in a position to support the present Ministry unless satisfactory explanation is forthcoming on certain points. The first question is, what is the principle of the convention under which the old Ministry resigned and on what basis the new Ministry was formed with the replacement of one with another from among Tamilian non-Brahmans. I feel sick of these communal and linguistic distinctions for political purposes and hope they will only be of use to me for a paper to be read before the Anthropological Society of Bombay of which I am the President. If the communal and linguistic basis be a sound one, which I do not admit, I have been wondering whether a worthy Minister could not be found from among the Tamilian Christians or Muhammadans and why the representatives of the Kanarese and Malayalam districts were not even thought of for this choice. Further I have grave doubts whether the Ministers are representatives of the large section of the electorate which forms the intelligentia of the Presidency.

" There cannot be any doubt that the Ministry does not command such a large majority as it did during the last tenure. If the opposition from among the elected members be not a majority, it will be a powerful minority. With such an opposition the further question is whether the record of the recent Ministry gives promise of a very useful tenure in the future for the present

27th November 1923] [Mr. J. A. Saldanha]

Ministry. I join with the previous speakers in an emphatic protest against the Religious Endowments Bill on which the Ministry sets its heart so much involving as it does undue interference with the autonomy of religious institutions. It seemed to me that the Indian Charitable and Religious Trusts Act, XIV of 1920 provides a cheap remedy for checking abuse of trust, by an application to a District Court and obtaining a certificate in case a breach of trust is *prima facie* established, for necessary litigation at the cost of the institution concerned. Such legislation as is embodied in the Bill in question has been attempted in certain countries of Europe and South America in connexion with religious endowments but has been vehemently opposed by Catholics; and if that Bill passes into law what is there to prevent a similar Bill being brought in connexion with Christian institutions?

"There is then the Madras University Act of which the Ministry is so proud. But as one of the alumni of two mufassal Catholic colleges, I fully realize the injustice and mischief it has done and is likely to do in future to such colleges affiliated on account of their high standard of equipment and education to the University on a footing of equality with those in Madras City by a treatment which is a distinct breach of faith on which the original affiliation had taken place and on the basis of which vast sums and energy have been spent for worthily equipping those institutions. There is absolutely no indication that the Ministry is repentant as to these measures and proposes any substantial amendment of the Religious Endowments Bill and the University Act.

"Further I may mention that I am pledged to a large section of my constituency to support legislation aiming at fixity and permanence of tenure to longstanding tenancy with a due *solutum* for loss of legitimate vested rights of landlords especially in Malabar. I understand that the Malabar Tenancy Bill drafted by my hon. Friend Diwan Bahadur Krishnan Nayar received very lukewarm support from the Chief Minister. As to its future there is a reference in His Excellency's speech in the Bill to amend the Tenancy Act. I am not aware of any such Tenancy Act in this Presidency. If it means the compensation of Tenants' Improvements Act (Malabar), I am afraid, the proposed legislation will be on wrong lines.

"The question has been raised as to the efficiency and purity of administration by local boards which I surmise depend upon the Presidents and Engineers nominated by the Ministry. Is the patronage in this connexion properly exercised? Fear has been expressed as to what would happen if the vote of censure be carried. I think it is a premature question and I am sure in case the motion is carried the different groups would through their leaders place before His Excellency the Governor the choice of the proper Ministers who could command the confidence of the majority of the House."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I may at once say, 4-30 p.m. Mr. President, that I desire to make a statement in regard to the matter which formed the subject-matter of a query of one of the hon. Members. The hon. Member who spoke last referred us to the resignation of the Ministers and wanted to know how it came about. I think it is due to the House, and in order to prevent further misconceptions and debate on the basis of that misconception I may inform the House by means of a statement, that His Excellency the Governor in consultation with His

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [27th November 1923]

Excellency the Viceroy decided to lay down a convention that after the elections are over the Ministers should resign and hence they were called upon to resign."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I presume the convention has been laid down for the whole of India."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"It is expected to be uniform in all the provinces."

Mr. J. D. SAMUEL:—"In my opinion the word 'therefore' in the resolution should really come after 'and'. The real reason is because the appointments were against the verdict of the general elections. What is the real verdict? People are called by different political names and we have no fixed labels. Nobody knows what I am and unless the political label is certain and definite nobody can say what really is the verdict. The way to judge about the verdict is to see with what principle the people went to the election and won their seats. Certainly it was not the Ministry and certainly it was not any particular general principle. In this respect our election is quite different from the English one where the Minister calls the country about a particular point, say tariff or protection. We are merely trying to copy it. I know two districts. There the chief question was not the Ministry but the cry was Kapu *v.* Kamma. Under those circumstances it is wrong to say that there was any specific verdict as to the Ministry except it be that it was for the non-Brahman. Don't you think His Excellency who gave us such an address yesterday would turn round and ask us what is your real verdict?"

Mr. P. ANJANEYULU:—"Sir, I first thought that it would be unnecessary for me to speak on this occasion when hon. Members have definitely and conclusively expressed themselves. But here I am to contradict the last speaker. He referred to the district which has returned me—Guntur. He said that it was the spirit of Kapu *v.* Kamma that influenced the electors. I am neither a Kapu nor a Kamma but a Brahman and it fell to my lot to head the polls in my district. I assure this to the House lest it be misled by the information supplied by my hon. Friend, the previous speaker, that in my district it was the spirit of Kapu *v.* Kamma that influenced the voters. It was not the sense of Kapu or Kamma that influenced them but it was a higher principle of trying to get nationalism out of the clutches—or meshes of communalism into which it has fallen. It was on this principle that a compact was formed in our district based on a political principle and not on communal interest. It was the reason why a Brahman also was taken into confidence, and as a proof of the good faith of my district, here I am heading at the polls. This shows that hereafter it shall not be communalism that will succeed but nationalism; and the party to which I have the honour to belong, the Nationalistic party, is also based on this higher principle.

"If to-day we are voting in favour of this motion let it be understood that we are not voting against the action of that towering 4-45 p.m. personality for whom we have got every regard and respect, but we are doing so because we wish, as it were, to elevate politics from communalism to nationalism and to purify the atmosphere of this House. With these words I support the motion."

Mr. P. PEDDIRAJU:—"I heard Mr. Samuel referring to the district of Kistna which returned him. No doubt in that district the parties were

27th November 1923] [Mr. P. PEDDIRAJU]

Kamma and Kapu but I do not belong to either of these parties. We are working on cosmopolitan lines for achieving nationalistic ends. We have fought together. No doubt we belong to different communities. No doubt one of the Kammas was elected but the real question before the electorate was whether to vote for those who would support the existing Ministry or for those who would oppose it. We have a particular grievance against the present Minister, but as my learned friend Mr. C. R. Reddi has referred to the District Board administration I need not refer to the details of the District Board administration. Suffice it to say that we have worked together to see that we got the franchise for the election of the President of the District Board. We have passed resolutions and sent them to the Government but our resolutions were unheeded. We sent a telegram too, before the nomination was made, to the Government asking them to receive a deputation of the District Board members but that telegram was not replied to. Shortly afterwards the nomination was made and we protested against that nomination but it was of no use. I may say in this connexion that the administration of the District Board of Kistna is anything but satisfactory for these two years. We wanted to hold a special meeting but that special meeting was disallowed by the Minister but subsequently I was glad to note that the Minister had been kind enough to pass an order that a special meeting should be called for. A special meeting was called for on the 24th of October and about 2,000 people representing all sorts of public opinion came to the meeting and asked all the members present and my friend Mr. Seethayya to vote against the Ministry in favour of this motion. In this connexion I must refer to one matter which the hon. the Minister in charge of Education referred to, i.e., that the passing of the Local Boards Act and District Municipalities Act, gave Swaraj to the people. I am sorry to say that the views of the Education Minister are very narrow. The Education Minister was democratic but as soon as he got into the Treasury Bench he became autocratic. No doubt the Act was a liberal measure considering the time when it was passed, but there is always an unfortunate provision in every Statute which gives power to the Governor in Council or the Governor to frame rules. The rules framed under this Act were all ill-conceived and I must say in this connexion that certain rules were framed which gave powers to the president of district board to interfere with the administration of taluk boards even with regard to the transfer of clerks, etc., and that this sort of interference by the district board is highly injurious to the interests of taluk board administration.

" Now I wish to refer to the Bezwada municipality to which Mr. Satyamurti also referred. We have had questions put and resolutions moved in this Council regarding the election of the chairman. The present Ministry had been promising to hold an election, but they were postponing it time after time, and after all postponed it. They now say that the wishes of the people are against election. I may also add here that the present Ministry who have been uplifting the non-Brahmans wanted to support a Brahman friend of mine because they saw that my friend was inclined to support the continuance of the present Ministry.

" Sir, I may say that we have come here to represent the cause of the ryots. We have not come here for loaves and fishes of office. We are the representatives of the ryots and we must discharge the trust reposed in us. Lay your hands on your heart and see whether the electorate wanted you to vote in favour or against this motion.

[Mr. P. Peddiraju]

[27th November 1923]

“One other matter to which I should like to refer is this: my friend Mr. Moore knows that a resolution regarding the ayacut in our district was passed in this Council some time back and that this subject had been the burning topic in our district for some time. I am not attacking the Reserved departments. All that I say is that the members of the party who belonged to the Ministerial Bench opposed that resolution brought by Mr. Ramachandra Rao. When they asked for the vote of the electorate they said they would represent the cause of the ryots. But when they entered the Council they voted against their cause. I am sorry that my district has suffered owing to the passing of this resolution to the extent of 10 lakhs of rupees. I may say here that the ryots in the neighbouring area who had also the same advantage as ourselves are in an advantageous position and consequently the ryots of our district have got a heart-burning because the Ministerial party voted in favour of this resolution.

“With these few words I heartily support this motion.”

Mr. M. SEETHAYYA:—“సభాద్వారా, నేను కృష్ణ జిల్లా ప్రజలవల్ల ఎన్ను కొనబడిన ప్రతినిధిని. నాకు తెలుగు తప్ప యింగ్సు రాదు. నేను వక్ పల్లెటూరు గ్రామ రయితునైయున్నాను. ఇంగ్సు రాకపోయినప్పటికి నేను ప్రజాభిప్రాయము యింగ్లుపువచ్చిన ప్రతినిధిలకంతె ఎక్కువగట్టిగా చెప్పగలను.

“మంత్రులను నీర్ణయించడము విషయంలో ప్రజాభిప్రాయమును అనుసరించి ఏర్పాతు చేయవలసిన విధి గవర్నర్ డుగారిషయిన్నదని సంస్కరణలలో చెప్పబడియున్నట్టు మీకండరికి తెలిసిన విషయమే. ఆట్లుగాక ప్రజాభిప్రాయమునకు వ్యతిరేకముగా మంత్రి వర్గమును యేర్పర్చుట చాలా అన్యాయమనిస్తే సదాచిత్తమునుండు ప్రజలకు విశ్వాసములేదనిన్ని వుపాదింపబడిన తీర్మానమును నేను ఆమోదించుచున్నాను.

“ఈ మంత్రి వర్గములోవారు యిరువురు గత మంత్రి వర్గములోవారైయున్నారు. గత మంత్రి వర్గముచేసిన చర్యలనుబట్టి యా మంత్రివర్గమునందు ప్రజలకు సమ్మతిలేదని తెలుపుటుకు కొన్ని సంగతులు మని చేయచున్నాను.

“అందులో ముఖ్యమయినది కృష్ణ జిల్లా స్టోనిక పరిపాలనవిషయము. జిల్లా ప్రజలకు అనుమతిలడయిన ది॥ బ॥ మోచర్ల రామచంద్ర రాఘవారిని గవర్నర్ మెంటువారు ఎడ్యుకేషను కమిటీ పని నిమిషము యింగ్లాండుకు పంపి మూడు సైలలు జిల్లా బోర్డు మీటింగులకు హజరు కాలేదనే సెపముమీద వారిని తోలగించి స్టోనిక పరిపాలనా చట్ట విధుల ప్రకారము వారిని తిరిగి మెంబరుగానుంచుటకు అర్థాలు అప్పుటా కాదా అనుసంగతి బోర్డులో తీర్మానం పెట్టుకుండా వారిని ఆ పదవినుండి తోలగించియున్నారు. ఆ సందర్భములో ప్రెసిడెంటును యొన్న కొనే అధికారమును యిప్పించవలసినదని బోర్డులో తీర్మానంచేసి యాం మంత్రివర్గమువారికి పంపించి సప్పటికి దానిసి విశ్వసించక పోవుటమే కాక జిల్లా బోర్డు మెంబర్లు డిప్యూటీపసుగా వచ్చేద పుని పానగల్ల రాజూగారికి పెలిగ్రాము యిచ్చినప్పటికి ఆ పెలిగ్రాముకు సమాధానము యివ్వక వారి అనుచర్చయినటియు స్నేహితులు అయినటియు బోర్డు మెంబర్లకు వ్యతిరేకులయినటియు ది॥ బ॥ తిక్కాని బాలాజిరావునాయుడుగారిని ప్రెసిడెంటుగా యొర్పాతుచేసి కృష్ణ జిల్లా ప్రజలకు పూర్ణముగా అసంతృప్తి కలుగజేసినారు. అప్పటినుండియు జిల్లా బోర్డు, తాలూకా బోర్డులోని నామినేషనులు అన్నియు, నిమ్మ జాతీయలకున్నా మైనారిటీ సంఘములవారికిని యివ్వక ఎలక్ష్మీలో వోడిపోయినవారి అనుచరులయిన కాండిడేటులకున్నా అందులో

[Mr. A. P. Patro] [27th November 1923]

the party stood with the hon. the Mover, Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar, who wanted not to press it to a division but only wanted to elicit a discussion on it. He was entirely satisfied with the nature of the opinions expressed by the party and others representing the Ministry. That is not therefore the fault of the Ministry. A reading of the report will clearly show what the state of matters was, viz., that the hon. Mover said that he is perfectly satisfied with the views expressed on the debate and that he did not want to press it to a division."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I think the whole position is perfectly wrong—"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I think we are plunging into a discussion of what took place in this Council some time back. I believe the proceedings are printed and copies given to all hon. Members. And I would propose to let them read the proceedings and verify the facts." (Laughter).

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, you have given it a delightful turn and I will leave it there. I plead guilty to the charge of being a newspaper politician. But I am confident that I shall now begin to improve as I have begun to hear political harangues from the hon. the Education Minister. But I repeat my charge that by not giving a lead to the House and by abdicating his functions on a matter of this kind, the Minister has failed to discharge his duty on this matter. Either he had no ideas on the matter or he had not the courage to express them."

"The other achievement of the Minister which I want to refer to is the appointment of Selection Committees to the Government Colleges. In this matter I speak not as a Brahman, but as an Indian. For the last two and half years we have been talking in this House, as if we were Brahmans and non-Brahmans and Christians. I think I am right, Mr. President, in saying that when once we cross the doors of this House we are no longer Brahmans, non-Brahmans or anything of the sort, but Indians, and ought to transcend all harness of caste and creed. Speaking as a Member of this House, as an Indian, in all humility I protest against this nefarious attempt to deny the benefits of education to a section of the people because they have the misfortune of being born in a particular community. I perfectly agree that such facilities as are necessary ought to be provided to all classes of His Majesty's subjects. If they did not find funds for doing so, this House surely would have gladly voted more funds for more colleges for boys and girls who come to receive education, but to say you shall not come in because you belong to a particular community is a dangerous precedent and inconsistent with the high principles of democracy. As a result of all this, education though it has been transferred, has remained in the same old bureaucratic rut; no national life has been infused into it and the bureaucratic machinery has remained unchanged except that an Indian has been getting the five thousand rupees which might have been paid to a European; no other change has been made.

"I want to conclude by saying a word about the Chief Minister. His achievements form the main point of the impeachment of my hon. Friend, Mr. Reddi. With regard to the Religious Endowments Bill, I do not want to enter into the merits of this Bill; but I know that in no country except in India a measure of this kind would have been introduced, unless it had been placed as a definite issue before the electorate in an election. But the Minister's

[Mr. B. Venkataratnam] [27th November 1923]

The permission was given and the hon. Member spoke as follows in Telugu :—“ Sir, although the motion as tabled speaks of want of confidence in the Ministers, in my opinion, it asks in reality for a vote against the Justice Party which has been in power for the last three years. Now, the Justice Party has been in power for three years, and we find schisms and divisions in the party ranks. The reason for this state of things is that the party is not based on any established political principles, it has no political programme, and it has not worked on any political principles (hear, hear !). If the party tried to put into practice the ideals, principles and intentions which actuated its members at its inception, all these difficulties would not have cropped up. But what has actually happened is this : this party has got only one idea and that is communal representation, and it has been carrying on its work for the last three years on a communal basis and that is why all these difficulties arose. In our country where there are so many communities, it is not possible to conduct the Government on communal lines. To-day the non-Brahman cry is raised ; the cry to-morrow may be non-Kshatriya, and day after to-morrow it may be non-Vysya, and so on. Therefore this prefix *non* has no meaning. Though their election promises and manifestoes were different, many members after their election joined the Justice Party. The record of the Justice Party does not show that any attempt was made at political advancement. As soon as the party came into power, the fight of the party was only confined to appointments in the Government service. But they do not seem to have any other programme and no attempt was made to work out their promised programme. My hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar fears that if this motion is carried, it might be said that we are not fit for self-government. But what I would submit is that if we defeat this Ministry the House will form into definite political parties and form a Ministry on political principles. Personally, I am not concerned with regard to the Ministry. My hon. Friend Mr. Samuel has said that there were sharp differences between Kapus, Kammas, etc., and that several parties are coming into existence. But I may tell him that though I am a Kamma I fought as a Swarajist and I have come to sit in this Council as a Swarajist (hear, hear !), and therefore I am not much concerned as to what particular party is in power. But still we are grieved to see that in the Madras Presidency communal Raj has come into being but not political Raj. Once we take up this communal principle, there can be no end to it, and I would therefore appeal to hon. Members not to support communal parties but only such parties as are guided by definite political principles.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I feel I am rather in an embarrassed position to-day. For, I am speaking under a very grave sense of responsibility on a matter which has been dealt with by many a previous speaker. We have drifted very far from the resolution which was moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi. Issues have been clouded fast one after another—issues which I am afraid have confused many of the Members here. From a review of the work of the Ministers, we have gone into a review of the work of the party and into unmentionable things to-day. I therefore think that a certain amount of freedom should be given to me if I am to give expression to my views freely.

“ Sir, I cannot congratulate the hon. Mr. Ramalinga Reddi on the resolution that he has brought forward to-day. I am sure that he has done a

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

great dis-service to this Presidency and also to himself by the motion that he has made. It is to this dis-service that I am going to refer now. I am not concerned with the issue whether the Justice Party will outlive this motion or not. I am not concerned even with the issue whether the Ministers will outlive this motion or not. This is a very small matter to me. Though I am a staunch adherent of the party, I say emphatically this is a small matter to me. The greater issue is whether the Reforms, for which I went to England among others, the Reforms for which we have been pleading for the last so many years, the Reforms which we have got not without travail and with the greatest difficulty, should be continued or not. I know there is a certain set of persons who have entered the Council, fortunately or unfortunately, with no other programme than that of wrecking the Council. These gentlemen started in the year of grace 1920 by saying that they were Non-co-operators who would not co-operate with the Government and would not have anything to do with the Council. Their liberal programme was the triple boycott—boycott of councils, boycott of courts and boycott of schools."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“On a point of order, Mr. President, may I ask how all this is relevant to the motion on hand? What has this motion to do with the programme of the Congress in 1920?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I presume that the hon. Member has some responsibility for these programmes.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“May I say that he may refer to me and not to the Congress?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I understood him to say that he referred to a body of people among whom the hon. Member is one.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“I would suggest that he might have the courage to say so. He referred to the party. He is indulging in a kind of attack upon the Congress programme. If his point is to attack some of us who are called Swarajists with a particular programme, let him address us in this House as the gentlemen who belong to the Swarajya party and not indulge in an attack upon the Congress.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I referred to these gentlemen and to one individual in particular who is the whip of the party, who are sitting in those two benches who call themselves Swarajists to-day, and who called themselves in the year 1920 Non-co-operators. I am going to try to show to this Council how they evolved themselves from the chrysalis stage of Non-co-operators to the butterfly stage of Swarajists. I told this House, Sir, that in the year 1920 they had a programme of boycott of schools, boycott of courts and boycott of councils. The boycott of schools was found to be a miserable failure, the boycott of courts was another ghastly failure, and the boycott of councils, after three years of patient thinking, they have come to realize, is unfortunate. I congratulate them. They appear on the opposition to-day. The Justice Party which entered the Council in the year 1920 were making their voice felt and now the Non-co-operators have come to realize that the ideals of the Justice Party in the year 1920 are the ideals which they must stand for now. That is my point. Sir, they have now come to the Council with the idea of obstructing the Reforms.”

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I rise to a point of order. The hon Member is saying that these gentlemen have come into the Council with the

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [27th November 1923]

idea of wrecking the Council. The first item on the Council's agenda yesterday was taking the oath, and they have solemnly sworn that they will faithfully discharge the duties on which they entered, viz., to carry on the work of the Council whatever other programme they had had before. Since they have taken the oath of the Council most faithfully, the hon. Member is perfectly out of order in saying that they have come to wreck the Council."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member may be unreasonable, but he is not out of order” (Laughter).

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“The hon. Member who has interrupted me is a Tamilian and does not unfortunately understand the language (Telugu) in which the previous speaker spoke. The previous speaker said that whichever Ministry is on the Treasury Bench, they were out to oppose it. If that is not what is meant by wrecking the Councils, I fail to see what it is. I must say that three years hence, in the year of grace 1926, these gentlemen will come and say that co-operation with the Government, wherever possible, is better than senseless obstruction and that a place among the comity of nations is better than nationalist applause.

“Sir, very grave charges have been made against the Ministry. I would have easily refuted them if they related to the Transferred subjects alone. But it is very unfortunate that the issues have been clouded by dragging in the party also, the party which the gentlemen opposite are anxious to wreck. ^{5-15 p.m.} ~~of~~ ^{air} “I want this House to realize that their object, their ideal, their policy, their hope and their prayer is that the party which has stood by the country for the last three years should not continue. We have seen the work of the Councils in other provinces. We know that the Ministries in other provinces are not able to make their voice felt on the administration of the Reserved side. We know that they are impotent to make their voice felt—”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“A point of order, Sir. It is not courteous to say that the Ministers in other provinces are impotent or that they do not make their voice felt.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“It is not out of order to say that a person is impotent.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“Whatever progress we might have made in this Presidency, whatever difficulties we might have overcome is because we had a solid party working with the Ministry. It is because we had a number of steadfast gentlemen who backed the Ministry up. If hon. Members are going to wreck all that, take it from me that it will be the bureaucracy that will be exalted, that will come into power. It will mean reaction in this Presidency. It will mean that the hands of the clock will be set back by many years. I want this House to realize the gravity of this situation even more than the gravity which attaches either to the out-going Ministry or to the in-coming Ministry. The hon. and learned Member for the University referred to many sins of commission and omission. He referred to the Chirala municipality. I ask him—‘Is there a single municipality in which the richer classes would like to participate in municipal administration? Municipalities are mainly intended for ameliorating the condition of the poorer classes. Municipalities are an unmitigated nuisance to the rich. It is the rich that pay the taxes and it is the poor that benefit by the existence of

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

municipalities. If this Ministry had thought it worth while to follow the dictates of the richer classes and abolished the Chirala municipality, if the hon. the Chief Minister had for a moment thought of abolishing the municipality, I for one would have crossed the floor of the House and terminated my connexion with such a Minister, such a reactionary Minister as would join hands with the richer classes of the country. The hon. Minister stood by the side of the poorer classes, and what is the result? The Chirala municipality stands there to-day. The men who were out against this municipality have come back to their senses. They realize the benefits of a municipality. They realize that they can have compulsory elementary education, only if the Chirala municipality continues to be a municipality. To-day the Chirala municipality has requested the hon. the Education Minister to introduce compulsory elementary education in that municipality. I shall give the House another instance of what the Chirala municipality is to-day. The results of the elections of the Chirala municipality are known to me. The hon. Member for Guntur, Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu, who opposed the abolition of the Chirala municipality, and who made a tremendously big speech on the Guntur repressive measures, said that the Chirala municipality should be continued and that the agitation was engineered by the richer classes. He comes at the top of the polls from the Chirala municipality getting 260 votes as against my hon. Friend, Mr. Anjaneyalu, who got 61 votes."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"A point of order, Sir. I presume that the votes are counted together and there is no means of knowing correctly what the vote from a particular constituency was."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That is not a point of order."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I shall give him that information. The information I got was from a vernacular paper which published the results, polling station after polling station. From the published records of a vernacular paper I got that information. I make a present of this information to my Swarajist Friend and ask him whether the country stood behind my Friend who jumped into the Swarajist Party or whether it stood behind my hon. Friend, Mr. Etirajulu Nayudu, who says that he stands for orderly progress and orderly development of the Government."

"I propose to have much more freedom this time than I had last. I propose to have as much freedom to oppose my Swarajist Friends who are here as to criticize the Government on the Treasury Bench. I ask again is the verdict of the country against the Ministry? My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, quotes some statistics. Ganjam returned one ministerialist to the last Council. It returned two anti-ministerialists who were sitting on the opposite benches. They objected to every measure the hon. Minister brought forward. Ganjam is in the same condition as it was last time, with this difference that the hon. Minister topped the poll with a difference of 5,000 votes which is a little more than double the number of votes for the second candidate. Is it not an evidence of how the country stood by the Justice Party? Godavari returned an ex-Minister who is certainly a ministerialist. Godavari returned last time a late Colleague of mine Mr. Subbarayudu and Diwan Bahadur Seshagiri Rao Pantulu. This time it has returned an ex-Minister and a Swarajist. If it shows anything at all, it shows that the Liberals have no place in the country. It shows that Liberalism is gone."

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [27th November 1923]

"Did any of the hon. Members opposite say to the electorate that they disowned the communal principle for which we have been fighting for the last three years? Did any of these gentlemen, did the hon. the Mover of this motion himself tell the electorate that they would not stand by their communal principle, that they were against the preferment of non-Brahmans, that they were against school committees being appointed and that they were against college committees being appointed? I should like to ask these gentlemen whether they have set any other policy."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"So far as Coimbatore was concerned I said that all the three might be supported."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"I have read a great deal about the elections in Coimbatore. I am not going to traverse the ground. I ask them whether they fought the elections on the communal basis."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—"I fought the election as an avowed enemy of the leader of the ministerialist party."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"I do not talk of ministerialists or anti-ministerialists or of leaders or ex-leaders. I am speaking only of the communal principle that was observed during the last three years."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—"A point of order. May I suggest that this resolution is certainly against the Ministry and not against the Justice Party?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I believe we have been hearing a great deal about the Justice Party. It is true that the hon. Member now wants that the discussion should be confined to the Ministry, but a number of hon. Members who have already spoken made various attacks on the Justice Party. The hon. Member who spoke in Telugu made a very vigorous attack on the Justice Party. I know Telugu well. It would have been more appropriate if this objection had been taken at an earlier stage."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"I have got the hon. Member's (Mr. Satyamurti) speech in his own words. He said that he wanted to make a breach in the ranks of the non-Brahman phalanx. If that is his principle, I have no quarrel with him.

"Well, Sir, a great deal has been said about the appointment of district board presidents. I think that during the last few minutes much has been made of this very simple matter. It is said that district board presidencies have been given to persons belonging to the Justice Party. It is a very trivial matter. These nominated appointments are honorary appointments which, after all, have to go to party men. Burke in one of his masterly speeches controverts a similar objection. I stand for the principle laid down by him. It is a party cry that party men ought to be appointed. The Ministry cannot nominate men who do not agree with its principles, in whom it has no confidence and whose policy may be antagonistic to that of the Ministry. Is the hon. Minister going to nominate non-co-operators as presidents of district boards? Is he going to nominate Swarajist gentlemen to work these district boards? As I said, this cry about district boards is, after all, a party cry. It is a very trivial matter.

"Now, Sir, I do not wish to take very much of your time. I see that a great, bitter and a most vituperative attack has been made against the hon. Chief Minister. He has been subjected to such criticism as is unprecedented in Parliamentary debates. I am not here to say anything in defence of him.

27th November 1923] [Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar]

He needs no defence. But in defence of myself I shall give expression to my own feeling. I am sure that he will outlive all this. Men who have been in power, men who have tried to do their duty according to their innate conscience, with fear of God and fear of no man, these men are subjected to this sort of criticism. We must remember that criticism is a necessary ingredient to progress. In the very nature of things there must be such vituperation as an accompaniment to progress. He will therefore put up with these attacks which have been levelled against him, most provocative attacks, attacks of the grossest character, unfair attacks on matters for which he is not responsible. He has been traduced and abused for his supposed motives. He will remember that obloquy is a necessary ingredient in the composition of all true glory. He will remember that it is not merely in the Roman customs but it is in the very nature and constitution of things that calumny and abuse are essential parts of triumph. If he has been made an arbitrator of things in which he never arbitrated, he must remember that this is but the necessary ingredient and a necessary consequence to a political campaign. I am not afraid of these criticisms. Years hence when people look back upon the first Council and the first Ministry, generations of my countrymen yet unborn will review the work of the last Council and say that we have progressed. Years hence when all this vituperation, when all this jargon of party and influence, patronage and the rest of it are swept into oblivion, people will have a better appreciation of the character of the work which the Ministry has carried out.

"The Ministry were there for three years in the face of the greatest difficulties. They have had a most revolutionary career but 5-30 p.m. they have done work of a most independent character, work which has really advanced the condition of the Presidency, made it progressive, put it on a substantial basis. You may in a spirit of despair, in a spirit of revenge, in a childish spirit, in a spirit of partisanship, try to destroy the Ministry but surely there is something which lives after all these loud talks, all these catchwords and shibboleths of patriotism of fear of party union and party life, something will outlive, the solid good work that has been done by the last Ministry.

"My hon. Friend, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, referred in particular to a matter which I thought a gentleman of his standing should not have done. He referred to hon. Ministers travelling in saloons. I have heard a good deal said about it, that it is an idea inherently opposed to democracy, to growing principles of socialism for which Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar stands in this Council. I am sorry that a Member of his standing should have referred to the matter in that spirit. Even in Bolshevik Russia, Lenin and Trotsky travelled in special trains."

A VOICE :—Wherefrom does the hon. Member get this information ?

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“I have read it in the English press. I say it on the authority of the English newspapers. My hon. Friend says that hon. Ministers should not travel in saloons. May we ask him : ‘ Does democracy stop short with double first-class or with one-and-three-fifths which the hon. Member gets now ? ’ ”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I repeatedly moved in this Council that the first-class allowances should be reduced and my hon. Friend and his Colleagues have opposed that at every time except on the last occasion.”

[27th November 1923]

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Yes, Sir, we did so because we are members of the City and have no necessity for these railway allowances. It was however open to the hon. Member, Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, to say that he would not have double first-class ; it was open for him to decline to receive the higher fare and to take less. It was open for him to say that he must have less fare realizing his responsibilities, as he says, as a Member of this House. It was open to him, a born democrat coming from the people, blooming from the ryots, brimming with democratic fervour to say that he would only travel in a third-class like the Mahatma Gandhi himself and decline to receive more. But look, what is the fact ? I have got here a question which was answered the other day from which I find that the hon. Member himself—I mean Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar—has drawn between 14th of November 1921 and August 1922, no less than a sum of . . . ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I protest against such personal reflections as to what a particular Member has drawn as allowances and so on.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ If the saloon argument for the Ministers is telling why not the reference that Members should receive third-class fare ? ”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I do not object to that, Sir. I object to the hon. Member saying that a particular Member has received a particular amount as allowances.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ I think the hon. Member had better omit it.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ That is an answer given in public, Sir. I am not however anxious to take such trivial issues. I believe, Sir, that democracy is not inconsistent with treating our honoured citizens in the most respectable way. I know that the English Premier goes by special trains. These are after all trivial, childish notions which school boys may give expression to and not a member of the standing and position as my hon. Friend here.

“ Sir, I do not wish to go into all the other points raised, of which there are a good many, as a good deal of time will be taken up for reply. I say this in this House, that on this Motion will depend the future progress of this Presidency, on this Motion will depend the future development of that political life which every one of us here wishes to develop in this country (cries of ‘ Hear, hear ’). On this Motion will depend the advance towards that goal of Dominion Home Rule as my friend, Mr. Ramalinga Reddi, has called it, and Colonial Self-Government as we always termed it. I do not indeed realize how both these differ from each other. Every Member will realize before deciding the question the grave responsibility that he owes to the country and his constituency and to the Member himself who brought forward this particular Motion. I will only say, in the language of the poet :

‘ Though the mills of God grind slowly
Yet they grind exceedingly small ;
Though, with patience He be waiting
Yet with exactness grinds He all ’ ”.

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.